

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Per. 590.

Per. 1140 e. $\frac{36}{N.S.3}$

Per. 590.

Per. 1140 e. $\frac{36}{N.S.3}$

Per. 590.

Per. 1140 e. $\frac{36}{N.S.3}$



THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER

AND
CHURCH OF IRELAND MAGAZINE,

FOR
1834.

CONDUCTED BY MEMBERS OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. III.



DUBLIN:
WILLIAM CURRY, JUN. AND COMPANY.
SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL, LONDON.

1834.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,

AND
Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXVII. JANUARY, 1834. Vol. III.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS FOR THE YEAR 1833.

In making the following *political* remarks, we venture on an undertaking to which we acknowledge ourselves committed—but to the proposed performance of which, we feel ourselves as much disinclined as we know ourselves to be incompetent—at the same time, as it was the practice in our first series to give a monthly review of public affairs, and as at the commencement of the first volume of our second series, we gave a sort of political synopsis of what had occurred during the last year, we now deem it necessary to adopt the same practice—desiring still, that our friends and readers will give us credit for being better Christian than political examiners; for in truth it has been always our anxious object to warn our Christian brethren against launching into the stormy turmoil of politics. At a season of peculiar excitement, we lifted our voice against the tendency that ecclesiastics evinced, of going with the turbulent current—and not small was the obloquy and discountenance we met with, when we did our best to keep back spiritual men from the indraught of such dangerous and giddy eddies. Therefore, it is with no small hesitation we now enact the part of clerical politicians; and were it not that our Church, as national and established, is necessarily connected with politics, it would be far from us, indeed, to touch at all on such matters.

The commencement of the year 1833 found Popish priests and demagogues banded in resolute conspiracy to extinguish tithes, and starve the Protestant clergymen out of their parishes. It saw a rural insurrection in the central parts of Ireland—whose object was to make that resistance to tithes, which the priest proclaimed should be passive, as active and as energetic as bloodshed and murder could make it. We confess, that before the passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, all this was by us foreseen; we saw the Priests of the Church of Rome, as for life and death, active in promoting the agitation that succeeded in terrifying even a Tory Government into the measure; and we asked ourselves and others, *cui bono*, to what end did those priests act as with one mind in this matter. Was it merely

that certain Popish lawyers, half ruined gentlemen, and ambitious graziers and grocers, should sit as members of the legislature? Was it that the Relief Bill should re-act on the Reform Bill, so as to make the former a stepping-stone to grasp the latter? No, certainly; for what is Democracy to the Priesthood more than absolutism. Dr. Hussey had long ago honestly confessed, that the workings of their mighty machinery was independent of all forms of government; and so it prospered, all would equally serve as its tool or its victim. No. The well adjusted polity that would allow her servants to be Republicans in Baltimore—Radicals in Manchester—Carbonari in Italy—Absolutists in the Peninsula, and intriguers every where; the same laxity of accommodation which allows them to be all things to all men, so that they may gain all men, could not have induced them to make the Relief Bill so vital a measure as to require a crusade to be preached up, as for life or death, heaven or hell, unless it was to be attended with consequences to their order, much more important than that of admitting some forty or fifty members to sit in parliament.

And, certainly, never were four years so eventfully favourable to the designs of Popery, as have followed since the passing of the Relief Bill. The concession, by the Wellington administration, of this great measure on the ground of expediency, and not of principle; the surrendering it, as it were, at the point of a threat. Then the retributive expulsion of these intimidated men from the king's counsels—and the coming into office, under the CA IRA of the battle of the barriers of Paris, of a Whig ministry, pledged to undefined innovations. Then the democratic revolution, which has been called reform, but by which the constitution has lost its adjusting balance, and all its machinery is running down with rapid and ruinous velocity. Then the coalition to intimidate and controul the government, between the two sworn enemies of the Church—the delegates from the democratic and infidel population of the towns of England, and the priest-ridden and separation desiring population of Popish Ireland. The one pledged to overthrow the Church and aristocracy of England; the other the Church and the British connexion in Ireland. Then how many minor events have wonderfully helped forward and enhanced the political triumphs of popery; amongst which we may advert briefly to the vacillations in council, and the apparent differences of opinion amongst the ministers, with respect to the way in which the tithe resistance was to be met; some of the cabinet individually inimical to the Church—some neutral—some, however friendly, speaking and acting so as to give courage to the agitators, and induce the people to believe that they really had the rulers of the land on their side, and that it was the wish of Government that tithes should be EXTINGUISHED. We would especially advert to one important circumstance which has, in our opinion, been mainly instrumental in giving force and effect to the Popish conspiracy against tithes—we mean the tithe composition act. This measure, deservedly hailed by all

well-thinking men, as beneficial to the clergy, and to the people, as a great act of restorative justice, which went to supersede the agistment exemption, which the squires of Ireland so long enjoyed, and by means of which they had shifted the burden off their own shoulders, and laid it on the necks of the poor. The tithe composition act has had, nevertheless, a most injurious tendency in rousing a host of selfish, rancorous, and influential enemies against the clergy; enemies whose religious and political antipathies have been pointed by the sharpest selfishness. We allude to the grazing farmers of Ireland, a large, rich, and active body, who formerly paid little or no tithe, and who, by the operation of the composition act, have had their broad pastures viewed, valued, and submitted to a new impost. What was it to them that their poorer neighbours were relieved—that the potatoe-garden and con-acre were in a manner exempted. No; the Avarus Agricola could not see, through the mist of selfishness, the humanity of the act; and so in the counties of Meath, Kildare, Kilkenny, Queen's County, Tipperary, Galway, and Roscommon, where the grazing farmers are mostly Roman Catholics, there was a new, virulent, hostile body, raised up against the Protestant clergy; and as these men were the principal supporters and entertainers of priests; as their reverences live mostly upon their bounty and hospitality, so now the feeling of both parties acted and reacted on each other, and produced that determined hostility, which first broke forth in the columns of the provincial papers, and which exhibited all its determination, and all its virulence, in the speeches of such graziers as Mr. Lalor, and others of that stamp, in the Queen's county and other portions of the central districts of Ireland. We are quite sure that in many cases the *temperate* Roman Catholic clergy (for undoubtedly there are such,) were forced against their wills to preach up tithe resistance from their altars, by the substantial graziers of their parishes. And so the poor tillage farmers, and the cottiers and common labourers were persuaded, as a matter in which their Church, and their own souls' safety were involved in, to join a crusade against tithes—and in many cases to insult and maltreat the parson who had often proved their best friend, and often employed them, and supplied them with food and medicine.

When the year 1833 commenced, the resistance to tithes was in full operation. The system, as promulgated by the Popish hierarchy, and organized in the Popish chapels, was noised abroad by the Popish press; and while O'Connell from his tribune pronounced it patriotic, Dr. Doyle from his altar decreed that it was meritorious. The resistance was, it is true, as far as words went, to be UNBLOODY and PASSIVE. But when did ever the half savage Irish resist *passively* or *unbloodily*. No; never have Irish leaders, lay or clerical, recommended agitation, that bloodthirsty men did not arise, for whose acts their leaders disclaimed all responsibility; but of whose acts they were ever ready to take the advantage. Thus in the great rebellion, Roger

Moore and the Popish bishops disclaimed the atrocities of Sir Phelim O'Neil ; thus did Father O'Leary, in the last century, blow to a *white* heat, the people's opposition to tithes in the south of Ireland, and then disclaim all participation with the insurgent Whiteboys ; and thus have the lay and clerical agitators of the present day maddened the people by their speeches and pastorals, and then have they lifted up their eyes in horror at the misapplication of their views by the Whitefeet of Kilkenny, Tipperary, and the Queen's County ; at the same time, good souls, they have not been backward in taking advantage of the results of this savage insurrection, whereby the Protestant clergymen have been worried and banished, their property destroyed, and their lives endangered. We confess we so shudder at the idea of any man sitting coolly in his study, penning a pastoral, or rising to speak at a charity dinner, to make a *benevolent* speech, with the intention of arousing the animosities of a savage people, and directing the pike and the brand against the lives and houses of unoffending people ; for the honour of human nature we must acquit them of any such truculent intent---for the honour of the Christian religion, which they profess to believe, we must suppose that they miscalculated the motives, and misconceived the spirit of the people ; and that no priest would accept the triumph of his Church over prostrate Protestantism, when his trophies were laid before him steeped in human blood. But this we must ever lament, that Popish agitation has always been attended by such rural outbreaks. So that as sure as the demagogue or priest speak or write, so sure the Whiteboys or Whitefeet organize themselves to murder and destroy ; and in the mean time the desirable object is attained, of terrifying the loyal, and perplexing the government---of arming the disloyal, and confirming the strength of Popery ; and what if coercive legislative enactments are the necessary result ; these only for a time, and in one peculiar locality, repress the insurrection ; while the disaffection of the people is increased, and the demagogue is ready to point to the law, and say, let your hatred to it be as eternal as your love of justice, for what is it to you but an enemy and an avenger.

The year 1833 commenced with a state of affairs disgraceful to any government or any country. A body of clergy preaching up resistance to a payment which the law sanctioned, and a people so demoralized as to consider that not only might they withhold that which they had covenanted to pay, but that they might perpetrate murder in furtherance of their resistance---a government so vacillating as at one time, by a firm exercise of military force, terrifying the most disinclined into the payment of their tithe debt ; and then after, as it were, thus tantalizing the clergy, pronouncing that tithe property should be beyond the pale of peculiar protection ; and subsequently countermanding all future military assistance to put the law in force against an insurgent people ; and then, to save the poor and terrified clergy from actual starvation, arising a sum of money from the empire at large, to be given as a

loan, upon terms so usurious that nothing but strong necessity on the part of the borrowers should have induced them to accede to, or the bad security offered for the repayment could have justified the lender in having the conscience to exact ;—and what, after all, was that, but calling on the Protestants of the empire to relieve the disaffected and dishonest Papists of Ireland from the payment of a just debt, which like stout rogues they had sworn never to discharge; what was it but making the Protestants of the empire help the Irish Government out of a scrape, into which their own weak unsteady measures had brought them: and thus stands Ireland at the close of the year 1833, with respect to the tithe question.

By the new Ecclesiastical Reform Bill, passed last session, the landed property of Ireland is for ever discharged from the burden of church cess. We congratulate the country in being relieved from this vexatious and unjust impost; but we deem that the government not only took a bad way, but a bad time, for effecting the relief. Surely a government who deemed that the existing law should be respected, ought to have withheld concession of *any sort* from a people who stood out in resistance to what the legislature declared to be legal—as resisters of the law, they should have had no indulgence from the legislature; the abolishing of church-cess, in favor of the *passive* resisters of tithe, was but a *bonus* given to rebels—a premium bestowed on lawlessness. But we have objected, and do still object, not only to the time, but mode of relieving the landed property of Ireland from the payment of church cess. We allude especially to the most important means of providing for the uses to which parish cess was applied, namely, the appropriation of the revenues of the suppressed bishoprics. We never could understand why it was that government did not rather curtail, according to a proportionate scale, the income of the twenty-two existing bishops, than totally suppress ten out of the number. There is reason to believe that the Irish bishops would have made a great, and to them severe, sacrifice of their income, rather than see this dangerous curtailment of their number take effect. And when Ireland has, year after year, to lament the encreasing number of her absentees, we cannot see what ground of expediency the originators and supporters of that measure had, save the pleasing of the Popish hierarchy, for thus getting rid for ever of ten of Ireland's most useful resident nobility. The system has already begun to work; the Archbishop of Cashel has removed to Waterford. The town of Cashel, which perhaps wanted a resident nobleman or gentleman of fortune, as much as any other place in Ireland, is deprived in future of a person capable of spending seven thousand a year. This may be a matter of much congratulation to priests, and no doubt there are pestilent bigots amongst them, who would rather see the poor of the vicinity of Cashel unemployed, and its tradesmen starving in its streets, than be subject to the offensive presence of a Pro-

testant prelate. But we who remember the residence of Dr. Broderick in Cashel, and recollect how liberal he was in his charities, how munificent to many, how considerate for all, cannot but lament that from such a vicinity and from such a people the possibility should be taken of again enjoying the presence of a bishop like him. The relief from church cess, even suppose it was a compliment paid, as due to the loyalty, obedience, and gratitude of the Roman Catholic landholders, would be a poor compensation, even to them, for the removal from their vicinity of such a nobleman as Doctor Broderick.

But this is only an economical view of the question. Surely, in a spiritual and ecclesiastical sense, this measure also was injurious. For what has been one of the evils of the Irish Church?—what one of the evils of the English Church? Certainly that prelates have been placed *above* their duty: that the distance between them and their clergy was too great; and that, in the height and remoteness of their station, they were but too apt to overlook, rather than oversee their dioceses. The Church wanted the preaching prelates of good old Latimer's school; men who would preach about, like him; ride about, like him, and see with their own eyes, and hear with their own ears, and who would say to their clergy, as the active general would say to his officers, "I don't want you to go before me, but I call on you to come along with me." Such were the prelates we wanted for the Church militant here in Ireland; and it would have been most desirable that their existing numbers should be increased: and while they ought to have incomes and patronage sufficient to maintain the true respectability of their station, the overplus might have been withdrawn that seemed to encourage that distance, and heedlessness, and irresponsibility which should belong only to the creatures and followers of the Roman Pontiff. Moderate Dissenters were looking forward to some such change as this, as one of the means, under God, of healing schism, and comprehending, within the bounds of an Orthodox Church, those who were consentaneous in doctrine, and warm with the love of souls. But, alas! this ground of probable union has been renounced, and we are to have twelve LORD Bishops, who must have good constitutions indeed; sharp eyes, and long ears, if they travel as they should do, hear and see, and preach, as they should do, over the wide extent of their magnified dioceses.

And here, as honest and fearless CHRISTIAN EXAMINERS, we must, before withdrawing from this subject, remark, that certain of our bishops have, by their frequent absence from their sees, given too much room to the Church's detractors to hold, that as those dioceses have done so often and so well without the residence of a bishop, they can continue to dispense with their presence altogether. Surely they *have* said, or they *may* have said, that a prelate who has been away for business, or pleasure, or health, twenty months in two years, may bid good bye to his see for ever. Now our opinion is, that such events, whether

unavoidable or not, only prove the necessity of coadjutors, or suffragan bishops; and we are tempted to think that if such a deputy should necessarily be appointed in any diocese, with a remuneration equal to one third of the episcopal funds, during the absence of its bishop, the welfare of the Church would be promoted, and we should see much less of episcopal absenteeism.

It is to be hoped some future arrangement will be made, whereby our comparatively idle and numerous deans and archdeacons will be made responsible and efficient ecclesiastical functionaries, doing the work of suffragans and coadjutors in our enlarged dioceses.

Another great public act, affecting our Church, has passed the legislature this year, well intended, no doubt, by the ministry, in order to supply to the Irish clergy the means of support which their vacillating policy deprived them of. Perhaps, also, this parliamentary loan was intended to prepare the minds of the clergy for a future dependence on the treasury. The clergy, by strong necessity, have been obliged to take advantage of this suspicious *bonus*, and while with much misgiving they have stretched forth a reluctant hand, they confess that their poverty and not their will consents. Whether this money is ever to be reclaimed from them, or whether they will ever be enabled to repay it, time only can tell. The Papists say it never shall be repaid; and it remains to be seen whether a ministry which lives upon shifts, and reposes on measures of versatile expediency, will ever risk the consequences of enabling the clergy to enforce the payment of the tithes due by the people. Our opinion is, that payment never will be enforced, and that some commutation of tithe property will be carried into effect next session of Parliament, which will, we trust, for ever remove the necessity of the Protestant clergy in Ireland coming into collision with the Roman Catholic people. If a commutation of landed for tithe property could be brought about—if the many thousand acres of crown lands which are *now* in the possession of, or are now being reclaimed by the state—if the Curragh of Kildare and other great commonages of Ireland were applied to Church purposes, or if the 600,000 plantation acres of Church lands could be again virtually restored to the Church, so as that their entire rents would be made available to the support of the bishops and clergy; or if *this* were found impracticable—if the landed proprietors of Ireland, (and it is no matter whether this proprietary consisted of fee-simple, profitable, leasehold, or mortgage,) were made to assign over to the Ecclesiastical Board a certain number of acres, or a certain rent-charge, recoverable over their whole property, equal in yearly value to the tithe income for which their properties are *now* under composition: these would be commutations most desirable for the clergy, and beneficial to the country, and a good exchange would be made for both parties.

But if the clergy are to be made mere pensioners on the Treasury, supported by an annual grant from that Parliament

where O'Connell and his tail can form a coalition with the Radical and Dissenting interests of England; then, indeed, as a vote can feed them, so a vote may starve: and the independence, nay the existence of the Church may be despaired of, and we may say its days are numbered. And so, consequently, are the days of the connexion between both countries. For we firmly hold, that on the existence of the Church of Ireland depends the union, and more than the union between the two islands. The priests and agitators know *this* well, and therefore it is that they would drive away the Protestant clergy. Their expulsion is but the means to arrive at an important end. The Protestant clergy (and we desire to include our orthodox dissenting brethren in this view) have been mainly instrumental in nourishing and upholding the loyalty of the Protestant yeomanry and tradesmen of Ireland; and if these men are, by a Popish conspiracy, now deprived of their natural watchmen and counsellors, of what earthly consequence is it to them the maintaining a connexion which, while it lasted, allowed them to be deprived of all that made that connexion worth fighting for, namely, their civil and religious immunities, their own protection, and that of their clergy.

When all the Papists of Ireland are armed—which arming is the great end and aim of all Whitefeet and Whiteboy organisation, and so far Captain Rock has been very successful in almost every portion of Popish Ireland—and when the Protestant clergy are abolished, and the Protestant yeomanry are disarmed, and are all either expatriated or disaffected, what has O'Connell to do but lift up his voice and the union is dissolved? What has the fiercer Papist, that will rise on the shoulders of O'Connell, to do but to lift his sword, cut the painter, and the separation of the two islands is effected at once and for ever.

Surely the British government are not so insane as to intend the abolition of the Established Church in Ireland. No. We rest assured that the most able men in the ministry are anxious to uphold it; but so as that there may be no further collision between the clergy and the Roman Catholic people. And may not some measure be adopted that will effect this desirable end? Most anxiously should every friend to British connexion, and the true prosperity of Ireland, pray that it may speedily be brought about. There is one other measure which we anxiously desire to see brought into operation, and that is, a provision which will not only contemplate the support of the aged and infirm, but also employment for our able-bodied and idle population, who are starving in a country where there is so much to be done, and where there are so many hands to do it; but where those who have capital are disinclined to employ these hands in improving their country and increasing its capabilities. We know that a Board is now sitting in Dublin, occupied in collecting information on this subject; but we have reason to suspect that some, if not most of its ablest and influential members are prejudiced against a compulsory provision for the

poor. Acquainted better with England than Ireland, they may, as detesting the misapplication of poor funds in a system that groans under the accumulated abuses of three centuries, argue against the use from the abuse, and maintain that as the English system has only increased the evil which it was intended to check, so the same results *must* follow in Ireland: yes, certainly, if the *very same system*, with all its abuses on its head, were naturalized in Ireland. But where is the necessity for this?—What are able men good for, if, learning by English experience, they are not able to pick the good out of the mass of evil—if they cannot file off the encumbering rust, and produce for Ireland the bright and working metal. Of this one circumstance all may rest assured, that Ireland without a poor law cannot be in a much worse state than she is, and that England, in spite of a poor law, has been surprisingly prosperous: nay more, we are quite aware that England is suffering most unjustly the effects of the unprovided-for pauperism of Ireland, and that this inroad of Irish wretchedness cannot be tolerated much longer. Of this, also, we are quite certain, that were our able-bodied poor employed in increasing the productive capabilities of Ireland; the capital so expended would nourish itself, industry would be promoted; agitation would be neutralized; our agriculture would be improved; our wastes made productive, and our fisheries become a source of food and plenty. To be sure, if Doctor Doyle's plan of a poor law was carried into operation, and if the landowners were made to pay what the landholder had the power of expending, then, indeed, would the Protestant proprietor be left at the mercy of the Popish farmer and tradesman—then, indeed, would that consummation, so long and *devoutly* wished for, come to pass—the priest getting his hand into the Protestant gentry's pocket—and soon a transfer of property would take place, ample as a Popish bishop could wish, and that without a formal repeal of the act of settlement.

But this is not *our* plan for managing the fund to be applied towards raising the condition of the poor in Ireland. We hold, that all that have property in Ireland should be made to contribute towards making that property more secure, more available, more saleable, and more productive. We hold, that not only the landlord, but the fundlord—not only he who is *nominally* in possession, but he who has a beneficial interest in landed property—not only he who holds the fee, but also he who has the profitable lease, or the freehold, or the mortgage, or the judgment affecting a property—should be made to bear his *proportionate* share of the burden. Every one who knows any thing of Ireland must be aware how deeply the landed proprietors of Ireland are in debt, and that, if their respective creditors were *at once* to enforce payment, there would be a mighty transfer of property all over the country. This state of things, arising, as it did, in the first instance, from the long sustained extravagance of the Irish gentry, was confirmed and aggravated by that most unjust and ruinous

act to many a poor gentleman in Ireland, whereby the creditor, who lent in depreciated paper, was enabled to demand the full amount of his nominal debt in gold, and thereby advantage himself to the amount of a full one-third over and above what he had a *just* right to demand. We say, then, that to force only a provision for the poor, from the deeply encumbered and, perhaps, under necessity, expatriated landlord, while his creditors, his already unjustly advantaged creditors, would remain exempt, would be, indeed, an act of monstrous injustice, which no legislature could contemplate, without the desire of taking Irish landed property altogether out of the hands of its present owners. No; we deem that a provision for the poor should be raised equally from all sorts of property, and the management of the fund, when raised, should be so arranged that each individual, in proportion to the amount of his contribution, should have more or less votes. As, for instance, we would suppose that the man who paid ten shillings should have one voice; he who contributed a pound, two voices; he who contributed ten pounds, twenty voices, and so on. Thus, if the rich paid, so also would the rich have the direction and control over what they paid: and, in this way, as long as Protestants had the largest share of the property, so long would they enjoy the means of protecting that property; and Doctor Doyle's insidious plan of giving Romish priests the distribution of the poor fund would not be practicable.

For our parts, looking at the prosperous state of England with a poor fund, and the degraded state of Ireland without one—seeing the rich, in one country, obliged, and that confessedly at an extravagant rate, to support the poor; while it is well known that it is the poor that support the poor, and that with a comparatively greater waste and misapplication of their substance, in Ireland—conscious that, in our country, money's worth to an enormous extent is levied from those who are next door to paupers themselves, and *that* to maintain a vicious, disgusting, crime-and-disease-multiplying mendicancy through the Island—we assert that religion, morality, and common sense, cry aloud for a provision for the poor, to be drawn from the pockets of those who, in the whole community, now pay least, and who just now think they are free from all responsibility, if, on Sunday, they cast a bit of silver into the poor-box, not as the widow's, but the rich man's mite! Oh! how we wish to see those hard-hearted wealthy—those who build a porter's lodge at the entrance of their well-closed demesnes, to exclude the poor—obliged to pay. Let the political economists say what they will, there *must* be a compulsory provision for the poor made in Ireland.

On one more topic let us briefly remark, before we close this paper. Agitation is now directed towards a Repeal of the Union, which, as every one must be aware, involves, in the scope of a thorough Papist, the overthrow of the Established Church; the political separation of the two Islands; the upsetting of the property of Protestants acquired by former confiscation, and the

enactment of a tariff against British manufactures; and, though last, not least, the power of the Romish priest to put his hands into the pockets of every man in Ireland. ALL these views are confessedly not *now* put forth by O'Connell, who is at present endeavouring to gain over the irritated Protestants of the North of Ireland. He would *now*, with uplifted hands, disavow, to be sure, the greater part of these views. He merely tells those whom he *now*, for the first time, flatters, in order that he may mould them to his will, that a British Parliament 'is composed of those who dislike Ireland, or think light of its interests, and that it has neither *time* nor inclination to do *full* justice to the wants of this country. Now we are quite sure, that if a plan, lately suggested, of holding the Imperial Parliament in Ireland every third year, was adopted, it would satisfy, not certainly O'Connell and the priests, for agitation is as life and money to them—it is the craft by which they get their living—but every well-thinking Protestant and moderate Roman Catholic in Ireland. The facilities for travelling are so great, and the prospects of still greater facilities so certain, the accommodations in Dublin so ample, that the removal of the Court and Parliament could be effected without much inconvenience; and there can be no doubt but that, after a few sessions held in Ireland, English and Scotch members would acquire such a practical knowledge of the country—of its wants, its capabilities, its parties—in a word, of its good and its evil, that they would not, as they often now vote, as ignorant and prejudiced men, endangering the empire, and injuring a good cause, by absurd and mischievous legislation.

Let us then briefly re-state what are the measures that, in our humble opinion, would prove practically beneficial. In the first place, a firm and really impartial administration of the existing laws, without allowance for any man, or body of men, to offer either active or passive resistance to them. The fearless and unrelenting punishment of culprits offending against the law. The support of the Established Church, and the rendering it more safe and efficient by such a commutation of tithes as may remove its property from any connection or collision with Roman Catholics, and by permitting the Church to adopt such a reform in her polity as may render her more spiritually efficient, and more able and active in instructing the people. By establishing a legal provision for the poor, so guarded and contrived as to avoid the errors and abuses of the English system, and fit it to the political, moral, and religious character of the Irish. And, lastly, to have a triennial session of the Imperial Parliament in Ireland. With steam-boats, railways, and steam-carriages, the transit of court and government would be readily effected, and the accommodation not only of King, Lords, and commons, but all the paraphernalia of a court supplied. We can easily turn the Custom-house into a palace, the Rotunda into a parliament house, and our Castle would serve, *pro tempore*, for the Horse Guards. In the mean time, from our hearts we say, God send us more good sense, and less agitation.

ON JOHN. *xii.* 20—26.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—I have often wished that some one, competent to the task, would take in hand the Four Gospels, and particularly that of St. John, with the sole view of tracing the connection of the several parts, in each of our Lord's discourses and conversations. In such an endeavour, I should wish it, moreover, to be the leading object, to ascertain, as far as possible, from the circumstances and associations of the moment, what might have been the probable course and natural current of his thoughts, while engaged in speaking. That this examination, closely and diligently pursued, would account, in many instances, for transactions which at first sight appear abrupt, and exhibit a consecutive chain of meaning, where no such chain was discoverable before, is my firm belief. Labour so employed would be doubly rewarded, and be attended with twofold benefit. It would, first of all, tend to illustrate many obscure passages of, confessedly, the most important part of Scripture; and, secondly, it would furnish a new and distinct internal evidence of the truth of Christianity. What I mean by the latter observation is this—If the doubt be entertained (and, however extravagant, it has been entertained,) whether the Gospel be a forgery, on the one hand, or a genuine history of real facts and persons, on the other, nothing could more effectually serve to prove that it is the latter, than the discovery of such a hidden and under-current of thought, as that to which I allude. In fictitious characters it is evident that no such thing could be traceable. The whole of these characters lies upon the page before us. They are whatever the forger makes them, and nothing more. They have no existence but in the narrative. They are like trees without roots—all is above ground, and there is nothing under, which grapples in visibly with the soil, and intertwines itself with other roots and substances beneath the surface. Consequently, if we have any difficulty in comprehending what such characters are made to say, we never can ascertain the meaning by a process of the kind proposed. We might as well dissect a statue to find out the causes of its malformation. It is in reference only to true and living persons that such a mode of elucidation can take place. Hence it follows that in any passages where our Lord's expressions or transitions of thought appear obscure or unaccountable, if light can be thrown, and the links of connection be discovered, by adverting to the engagements and associations of mind which would be natural to one placed at the moment precisely where the evangelists have placed him; in every such instance where you can thus fill up the chasms, or trace the secret chain of the discourse, you have a proof (weaker or stronger, as the case may be, but still proof of a nature capable of rising to demonstration,) that Jesus was not a fictitious but a genuine character;

may, more, that he was "indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world." Such a passive cross-examination, if I might so call it, may yet bring forth internal evidence, so manifestly out of the reach or possible contemplation of all forgery, and at the same time so bright, and so overwhelming, as to convince many, who had withstood every other argument, of the truth of Scripture.

As an ensample of the kind of investigation which I recommend, I will submit to your consideration the following remarks upon a part of the 12th chapter of St. John: a passage which had always appeared to me very obscure, as it respects the connexion of the several parts. It is from the 20th to the 28th verse, inclusive; the whole of which I shall, for convenience sake, transcribe.

"20. And there were certain Greeks among them that came up to worship at the feast.

"21. The same came therefore to Philip, which was of Bethsaida of Galilee, and desired him, saying, Sir, we would see Jesus.

"22. Philip cometh, and telleth Andrew: and again, Andrew and Philip tell Jesus.

"23. And Jesus answered them, saying, The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified.

"24. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat falls into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.

"25. He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal.

"26. If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be: if any man serve me, him will my Father honour.

"27. Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour.

"28. Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again."

The three first verses give us an account of certain devout Greeks, as is supposed, proselytes of the gate, who came up to Jerusalem, to worship at the feast. These persons having heard of the fame of Jesus, address themselves, as it were, in a body to Philip, and respectfully desire that they be admitted into the Saviour's presence. Philip then communicates the intelligence to Andrew; and the two apostles go both together, and tell Jesus. "And Jesus answered," that is, took occasion from this address to say, "The hour is come, that the Son of Man should be glorified." Now, what appears to be the natural connection between the matter presented to our Saviour's mind, and the deep-toned reflection which it drew from him? These strangers coming from amongst the Gentiles, flocking to his presence, and pressing to his standard, might, I say, have suddenly suggested to his thoughts those glorious days when "the Gentiles should come to his light, and kings to the brightness of his rising." To bring all nations unto God, was the end for which he came into the world. The means by which this great consummation was to be effected, was his own most bitter death and passion. But we know that the expectation of these sufferings sometimes shook our Saviour's human nature to its

centre. And in this view it is evident that, (as if to render his cup of misery complete,) he felt at times the pangs of irresolution, and of doubt; nay, that he was assailed and tantalized by the occasional and fleeting hope that the cross might be averted. That this was one of his severest trials, we may gather from a few remarkable passages of his life. Not to anticipate what we have to observe upon the words before us, we learn it from the horror with which he repelled the suggestion of this thought, when Peter said unto him, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee." And when he answered, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." We learn it still more from the inexpressible agony of soul with which he prayed, saying, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me."

The introduction of the Greeks, then, as I said before, naturally suggested to our Saviour's thoughts the glories of the latter days. Nor is it, I conceive, irreverent to suppose that, partaking as he did of the innocent infirmities of man, the momentary hope flashed across his mind, that this dawn might shine more and more unto the perfect day, unbroken by the dark and dismal night of his atoning sacrifice. But the flattering dream was quickly over, and the truth, in all its terrors, stands before him. The struggle of his soul was between the promising appearances of the moment, and the recollection that no effectual calling of the Gentiles could take place till he had undergone the suffering of death. Such another conflict he seems to have experienced in Luke xii. 49, 50. "I am come to send fire on earth; and what will I, if it be (or rather, O that it were) already kindled. But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" Many a struggle of this nature, but in a degree proportioned to the low and grovelling interests that engage us, we ourselves may have personally known. To take one instance. Have we at any time been afflicted with bodily disease, and armed ourselves with fortitude to submit to some sharp and painful remedy, as the only lasting and effectual cure? In this interval of suspense, we may have experienced how hard it is to suppress the hope, which every hour of ease or symptom of recovery suggests, that health may yet be restored without the dreaded process; and with what anguish the fond imagination is dissipated, and the awakened sense recovered, that the trying moment is still before us, and that we must prepare to meet it. Such in kind, though in dimensions and in intensity far beyond all finite comprehension, was, I conceive, the conflict of our Saviour's mind, when he stifled the risings of his human nature, and welcomed the cross and the glories to which it led: "The hour is come, that the Son of Man should be glorified."

It is deeply interesting, and affecting, to trace in the two verses that follow, how the same profound meditation is pursued, and how the blessed Jesus summons up every motive, and turns

to every argument, which could support him in the hour of trial. Though addressed to others, the whole is in the spirit of soliloquy and deep abstraction. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." The inward conflict of his soul still goes on. "Shall I refuse the cup of shame and horror, and return at once to my Father's bosom? But if I do, where will be the harvest of immortal souls? On my death depends the only hope of a lost and ruined world. And if I avoid the cross, those who would fly to it for refuge, are of all men most miserable. No glad tidings will ever reach their ears. They will wander through the wide waste of eternity, as sheep having no shepherd." In the following verse another motive is appealed to, one which he had often impressed upon his followers. "He that loveth his life shall lose it: and he that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal." That our Lord, in his character as man, looked forward to, and that he was cheered amidst his sufferings by the prospect of that immortal crown to which these sufferings led, is clearly set forth in Scripture. It was for the joy which was set before him that he endured the cross, and despised the shame. It was, moreover, as the reward of his obedience unto death, that "at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord, to the glory of God the Father." It is, then, in the strictest accordance with the assumption of our nature, that he should have called in the hopes of eternal glory, with which, as man, he was to be crowned, to arm his soul against the tremendous conflict with the powers of darkness.

In the 26th verse, we have a striking instance of that sympathy with his disciples, which the Saviour never failed to manifest, when contemplating his own trials. He knew that they were to be, in their degree, partakers of his sufferings. He knew that they were to be baptized with the baptism that he was baptized with, and to drink of the cup which he drank of. And, therefore, in proportion as he felt the terrors of the cross, his tenderness for those who were to bear it after him, was awakened.

In proof of this, I would point to the following instances. 1. In the garden of Gethsemane, we find him addressing the three apostles, who were witnesses of his agony, in these words, "Pray ye, that ye enter not into temptation." 2. In Luke xii. 50—53, he passes immediately from the contemplation of his own sufferings, to the trials and persecutions which awaited his followers. 3. In the 13th chapter of St. John, when that scene of horror which the traitor was on the point of acting, seemed for a time to absorb every faculty of his soul, he calls to mind, at once, with inexpressible tenderness, the bereavement to which his disciples were to be exposed, and says, "Little children, yet a

little while I am with you, ye shall seek me : and as I said unto the Jews, whither I go ye cannot come, so now I say unto you." 4. In Luke xvi. from verse 24 to the end, we discover the same inseparable association in our Saviour's thoughts, between his own sufferings and those of his followers. The whole passage is too long to transcribe. I am persuaded, however, that any one who will carefully compare it with the verses we are now examining, cannot fail to be struck with a remarkable coincidence. Such a comparison will, I think, at least clearly prove that the emotion which our Saviour felt when saying to Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan," was of the nature I have already suggested. But between these kindred passages one difference may be observed, namely, that in St. John, our Lord's feelings for himself are more detailed—and in St. Matthew, those for his disciples. And, therefore, the whole of the latter is, as it were, the opening out (and a most remarkable one I cannot but consider it,) of the 26th verse of the passage before us. To that I refer, and with no other comment shall repeat the words. "If any man serve me, let him follow me : and where I am, there shall my servant be : if any man serve me, him will my Father honour."

In the following verse, the inward conflict of our Saviour's bosom, seems, as it were, to reach its crisis. From the considerations he had called to mind, he had in a great degree calmed the agitations of his soul. But, as is well known, in extremities of suffering, the storm, if it rises again, rises with redoubled fury, and by surmounting every barrier we had erected, gives almost resistless demonstration that all further resistance must be vain. That the anguish which our Lord endured at Gethsemane thus intermitted ; that it alternately rose and fell, and at its return swelled into a more overwhelming torrent than before, appears from the language of St. Luke : "Being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly : and his sweat was, as it were, great drops of blood, falling down to the ground." So in the present conflict, the keenest pang was felt at the crisis of deliverance. "Now," said the blessed Jesus, "is my soul troubled," (as if all before had been comparatively light,) "and what shall I say ? Shall I say, Father, save me from this hour ? Shall I pray to him to send twelve legions of angels, and deliver me out of the hands of those who hate both him and me ? But how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be ? Was it not to suffer that I came forth from God ? And were not these mysterious terrors, and atoning agonies, from which human weakness is thus shrinking back, the price, and penalty, which I covenanted to pay, before the foundation of the world ? Yes—For this cause came I unto this hour. And, therefore, Thy will be done. Father, glorify thy name." Here the temptation ended. "Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again."

H. W.

ON THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—I beg leave through your columns to return thanks to your correspondent, J. C. L., for having kindly consented to publish a sermon preached in answer to my papers on the subject of the Priesthood of Christ. If I know myself, I desire nothing so much as truth, and upon important subjects I always feel an anxiety to hear the sentiments of those who differ from me. I never feel perfectly assured of the truth of an opinion I am led to adopt, until I have weighed what honest and intelligent opponents can say against it. I heard much of what J. C. L. had advanced in his sermon, and as I know that he is capable of giving force to any arguments that could be found to support his view of the question, I consider that the opinion which he holds has had every assistance which could be derived from an able advocate.

I confess J. C. L. has not convinced me that I have been wrong; and the absence of any one Scriptural proof for his view of the question, confirms me in my conviction that no such proof does exist. I have adduced numberless texts of Scripture, which speak of Christ as a Priest in heaven. J. C. L. has not adduced one single text which speaks of Christ as a Priest on earth, and certainly for no other reason but this, that there is no such text.

There remained, then, in the absence of direct Scripture testimony, only this course for him to pursue—to endeavour to prove Christ to have been a Priest, or rather to have executed the office of Priest upon earth, by showing that he did upon earth things which none but a Priest could do. To prove it, then, by inference, is what J. C. L. attempts, with what success will appear as I examine his arguments.

He has abandoned, as unsound and indefensible, one argument used by others, who have maintained that earth was the scene of Christ's Priesthood; i. e. that he acted as Priest in the slaying of the victim. He admits, "as an established fact, that laymen were occasionally allowed to slay the victim, but never to sprinkle the blood upon the altar;" so that if he could prove that Christ slew the victim, it would not thence follow that he was acting in his character of Priest. But he refuses to admit my conclusion, deduced from this "established fact," "that we are to look for the date of Christ's entering on his Priesthood, not from any period previous to his death, but from the time when he entered in with his own blood, to sprinkle it before the mercy-seat in heaven."

J. C. L. says, there are in my reasoning two defects; the first of which is, (and I cannot find out in his sermon the second,)

that the work of atonement is made to consist of the slaying of the victim, and the sprinkling of the blood.

I still, with all respect to J. C. L., say the same thing; the work of atonement consists of the slaying, including the previous sufferings of the victim, which is performed on earth, without the necessary interference of the Priest; and the sprinkling of the blood performed in heaven, to which was necessary and indispensable the intervention of the Priest.

He speaks of another part of the work. "There is an entire omission of what to my judgment formed a most important part of the ceremony, *the consumption of the victim's body on the altar of offering*;" and this marked by him in Italics, to point out the stress he lays upon this position: and then, to prove the necessity of this "most important part of the ceremony," he refers to Lev. i. and quotes at length Lev. iii. 1—5. "And if his oblation be a sacrifice of peace-offering, if he offer it of the herd; whether it be a male or female, he shall offer it without blemish before the Lord. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. And he shall offer of the sacrifice of the peace-offering, an offering made by fire unto the Lord, the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards. And the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which is by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away." How could J. C. L. make such a strange confession here? Was it possible that he forgot that in the peace-offering there was not "the consumption of the victim's body on the altar of offering." The fat only was burnt upon the altar, the body of the victim was eaten as an eucharistic feast by the offerer, the priest having a part of it for his share. But this "most important part of the ceremony, the consumption of the victim's body on the altar of offering," took place but in one of the many sacrifices prescribed by the law, namely, in the whole burnt-offering. It did not take place in the sin-offering: the body of the victim was not burnt upon the altar of offering. On the great day of atonement, where especially was the Priesthood and sacrifice of Christ typified, "the bullock for the sin-offering, and the goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought to make atonement in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp, and they shall burn in the fire their skins and their flesh and their dung, and he that burneth them shall wash his clothes," &c. (Lev. xvi. 27.)

Here we see that it was not a most important part of that ceremony, by which atonement was made, to have the victim's body consumed on the altar of offering. The sin-offering, however, though not burnt on the altar, was burnt without the camp, and did typify, as the apostle in the Hebrews tells us, Christ suffering without the camp; but this will not assist J. C. L. in

finding something belonging to the atonement besides the sprinkling of the blood, which must be done by a Priest; for it was not the high priest that burned the sin-offering on the day of atonement. "The bullock and the goat shall one carry forth without the camp, and they shall burn in the fire their skins, &c. &c., he that burneth them shall wash his clothes, &c." But there was one offering which the priest was to burn upon the altar; this was the whole burnt-offering. I entirely disagree with J. C. L. as to what was typified by this burning by the priest, upon the altar. He says this burning was to point out to the sinner the fearful consequences of sin, and the awful nature of God's wrath. I conceive, on the other hand, that the fire of the altar consuming the animal, represented God's favourable acceptance of the sacrifice, rather than his wrath upon the victim. The offering was supposed to ascend to God in the flame, and therefore, in the Hebrew, the whole burnt-offering has its name from a word that signifies ascending. This appears to be just the difference between the burning of the sin-offering by a person not the priest, without the camp, and the burning of the burnt-offering by the priest on the altar; the one signified God's wrath lying on the victim; the other God's gracious acceptance of the sacrifice: and both these have their antitype and fulfilment in Christ. He bore God's wrath when he suffered without the gate; He was accepted of his Father, and had the token and sign of acceptance when He was raised up and ascended into the heavens (John xvi. 19 :) when the great choir of angels say, "Lift up your heads ye gates, and be ye lift up ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in."—(Ps. xxiv.)

There is a confusion and error in these allusions of J. C. L. to the legal sacrifices, at which I am somewhat surprised. I feel assured that when he re-considers them, he will himself admit his error.

The only other argument which I find in the sermon is drawn from its being said in many places, that Christ offered a sacrifice—offered himself. From this his argument seems to be, that none but a Priest could offer. Christ did offer himself on the cross whilst on this earth, therefore he must have executed the office of a Priest upon earth. He quotes, besides other passages, Heb. x. 12. 14, and adds, "There is an express mention made of an offering by Christ somewhere. That this cannot refer to his intercessory offering, I think, because that is continuous, and must be a thing of unbroken recurrence until the conclusion of his mediatorial kingdom. It must have been, then, the great sacrifice of the cross that is here spoken of. According to St. Paul, then, Christ as a Priest (for it is admitted none other durst) CHRIST AS A PRIEST did offer himself, once for all, upon the cross, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, &c. According to the opinion of R. D. and such as hold with him, he did not. Which of these be right, judge ye."

Now all this seemingly triumphant argument falls to the ground upon the consideration of this simple fact, that the words offer and offering have two senses, and are used as implying two different things; 1st, the offering of an animal to be a victim; and 2d, the offering of that victim unto God. J. C. L. says, "It is admitted that none durst offer but a priest;" in the second sense of offering, this is true, but not in the first sense. It *was* not the priest's part to offer an animal to be a victim; it *was* the priest's part to offer the victim to God. I will give examples from Scripture. (Lev. i. 3.) "If his offering be a burnt-offering of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it of his own voluntary will." Here is offering not by a priest, and this is the constant language of the law; so that in this sense J. C. L. must retract his assertion, that none must offer but a priest, and he must own the invalidity of his argument that Christ must be a Priest upon earth, because he offers himself to be a victim on the earth: the argument rather runs the other way, that as it was a private man that offered an animal to be a burnt-offering, and not the priest, so it was in Christ's character as a man, and not as the priest, that he offered himself to be the victim.

But we have also the same word "offer" used to express the action of the priest, in doing his part of the sacrifice, and offering it to God. (Lev. vii. 8.) "And the priest that *offereth* any man's burnt offering, even the priest shall have to himself the skin of the burnt-offering which he hath offered." In like manner, Christ having voluntarily offered himself as man to be the victim that should bear the sin of the world, he further, in his character of high priest, entered into the holy-place, even heaven itself, and there offered himself without spot to God for us. There are two offerings, one typifying what Christ did upon earth; this did not require the offerer to be a priest: another typifying what Christ has done and is continually doing in heaven; this did require the offerer to be a priest. Christ did offer himself on earth to be a victim for the sins of the world; this did not imply or require his priestly character. Christ did, and does, in heaven, offer his sacrifice on the true tabernacle; this does imply and require his priestly character.

I think, then, the question between J. C. L. and myself, as to the Priesthood of Christ on earth or in heaven, stands thus. J. C. L. has not brought forward one plain text of Scripture which speaks of Christ executing the priestly office on earth, whilst I refer to many that expressly declare heaven to be the place of his priestly ministrations, as Heb. viii. 1., ix. 11. 24., x. 21, &c. J. C. L. was not satisfied with my division of the work of atonement into two parts; one done on earth without the necessary intervention of a priest, the other done by a Priest in heaven. He sought therefore to find and point out an important part of the work requiring a priest, and to be done on earth; in this he failed. He endeavoured likewise to ground an

argument in favour of the exercise of the office of the Priesthood on earth, from its being said of Christ that he offered one sacrifice; but as in many passages of Scripture those not priests are said to offer, he has failed here too, in proving Christ to be a Priest on earth, though he offered himself on earth to be a victim.

As to J. C. L.'s admiration of Archbishop Ussher's language, that "Christ offered his humanity upon the altar of his divinity," I can only say there is no accounting for taste. I think it very absurd; and the way of accounting for it, that the altar sustained the offering, and that his divinity sustained his humanity, &c. very childish and unsound. Those that would think this a good argument, would be caught by the sound rather than the sense. If it was ever so true that it was one of the peculiarities of an altar that it sustains the victim, and that the divinity of Christ sustained the humanity in his sufferings, still it would be bad logic to infer from thence that the divinity was the altar. This reasoning would as easily prove the divinity to be the cross as to be the altar. But in saying this, there is betrayed an error as to the office of the altar. It is not a peculiarity of an altar to sustain the victim; the brazen altar never sustained any victim, except in the case of a burnt-offering; and the golden altar (which was used on the great day of atonement, in the whole of which ceremony there was a peculiar type of Christ's great work of atonement,) never sustained any victim. It never had any part of the victim put upon it but the blood; so that after all, this play upon words grows out of a mistake as to the use made of an altar.

In conclusion, I would remind your readers that my great object in bringing this subject of the Priesthood of Christ before them, has not been to prove that Christ was not a Priest upon earth, but rather to enforce upon them that he is a Priest, executing his office for them in heaven. It is true that in considering his whole sacrifice, which is begun upon earth and is completed in the heavens, I do see reasons to lead me to think that the part which Christ performed on earth, he did not perform in his character of Priest, because I see that the types of what he did on earth were not necessarily performed by the priests: but to enforce this was not my object in taking up the subject; and if any person still thinks that Christ, as a Priest, slew himself upon the cross, even as the high priest, on the great day of atonement, slew the bullock and the goat for a sin-offering, I quarrel not with them, neither do I feel much anxiety to bring them to my opinion. What I am anxious for is, to fix their minds upon the large and important part of the atoning sacrifice which Christ, as the High Priest of our profession, was to perform on his entrance into the heavenly sanctuary, and which he never ceases, and never will cease to perform in heaven for his Church until the dispensation of grace shall be brought to an end. Those who consider that the antitype of the altar is

to be looked for any where out of the heavenly places, whether they think it to be the cross, or the divinity joined to the humanity during Christ's sufferings, they leave just nothing to be done by Christ in his character of Priest in heaven. If the altar which was shadowed forth by the legal altar was upon earth, and if Christ, the great High Priest, performed his Priestly office on that altar on earth, then nothing remained for him to do as a Priest in heaven. For I may well ask, what had the priest to do in offering a sacrifice, after he had performed what was to be done upon the altar? Nothing: he had finished his work. But if the antitypical altar is in heaven, then after Christ left the earth, he had to go to the place where the true altar was, to do the important work of the High Priest connected with the altar. This I conceive to be the real position of Christ our High Priest, now in the heavens; as it is expressed Heb. viii. 1, 2. "We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man."

But it may be asked, who denies this? Every one who makes the altar on which Christ officiates, as Priest, to be on earth. J. C. L., who approves of the assertion, that the divinity sustaining the humanity of Christ, in his sufferings on earth, was the altar; J. C. L. who says, "Christ was as a burnt-offering upon the altar, when he was suffering the flames of God's wrath," and that "he was a Priest, *'laying in order'* both his soul and body upon the altar-fires of God's wrath." All these make Christ's work as Priest, at the altar, a past transaction. They put the altar upon earth, and they make the High Priest a member of a worldly sanctuary and not a heavenly. It is against these mistakes that I write. I wish to lead Christians to consider this subject as the truth is, and in a way that shall bend their hearts and their affections to a living High Priest, now performing his Priestly office for them in heaven; that shall encourage them to draw nigh to God, in the full assurance of faith that they have an High Priest over the house of God, who now lives to intercede for them upon the ground of his sacrifice and blood-shedding, which he pleads for them before the mercy-seat in heaven. I wish to make Christ more dear and more near to every believer; more continually looked to, whilst they are running the race that is set before them. This is my object, and it is with me a small thing to be judged of man's judgment, as setting forth views bordering closely upon those maintained by Crellius and others of the Socinian school. Selfish man does not, at the first hearing, receive the lesson which even hints that he has been wrong; but time and consideration overcomes his prejudices. I shall wait patiently for this effect upon J. C. L.; and by the manifestation of the truth, I hope to commend myself to every man's conscience, in the sight of God.

R. D.

ON THE NATURE OF THE DIVINE OMNIPOTENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—Your correspondent H. W. in your December Number, has furnished us with an extraordinary composition on the nature of the Divine Omnipotence, which, harmless as it is to those of your readers that think a little, may yet, as I conceive, mislead some few of them that do not think, especially when it comes from a writer so much admired and respected as H. W.; and for this reason I beg leave to solicit your insertion of a few remarks on what I shall in courtesy call his arguments, not undertaking, however, as will easily be seen, to expose even the half of his absurdities.

The proposition that he enunciates is a novel one, "that no such attribute as an unlimited and absolute Omnipotence can exist." If it be meant by this, to deny the existence of an Omnipotence that could perform absolute impossibilities, such as to make that not to have been which has been, or that not to be which is, he would be fighting with a shadow, and denying that of which no one ever asserted or could conceive the existence. But the Omnipotence which he affirms not to exist, is one of which men have a false notion, one which he expects many of his readers to be startled at hearing denied—an Omnipotence that God would exercise if he were to banish all evil and suffering from the universe, or if it were to effect in the twinkling of an eye, all that he now effects by means and processes. Such an Omnipotence as this, if there be any meaning in what he says, he denies the existence of. And what are his arguments?

The first is from the concession of his adversaries. "I know that many may at first sight be shocked at the assertion, that the power of God can in any sense be limited. In this, as in various instances, they will object to the same truth, as a distinct proposition, which they will freely assume and take for granted in all their reasonings. Those very persons will speak of Providence as devising means, and moving by gradual approaches to the accomplishment of an end. If asked, 'Why not decree the end without the means?' they will answer, 'Because it could not be attained, at least so well, without them.'" Now the proposition which those persons object to is, not "*that God cannot do impossibilities*;" there is nothing startling in that; that would be to deny merely that God both can and cannot do certain things; that his power can perform that which is the contradiction of all power. But the proposition they object to is, *that no such attribute as unlimited and absolute Omnipotence is in God*; which H. W. affirms they take for granted in this reply, and proves it thus; "If then the term *could not*, be at all admitted, no such thing as unrestricted Omnipotence exists." Here we have a pretty sophism, a *dicto secundum quid ad dictum sim-*

pliciter. H. W. takes the term *could not* in an absolute sense, meaning *could not possibly*; while the objectors use it in a limited and relative sense, *could not as well*, that is, consistently with his plans and purposes. The distinction between these two senses of the terms *cannot* or *could not*, though he is blind to it here, W. H. employs properly enough, when he tells us very properly, page 813, that it is the same thing to us whether God cannot pardon sin consistently with his attributes and moral government; or whether he cannot do it because it is impossible. In the former case, as well as in the latter, he tells us that God *cannot* save impenitent sinners. But whether the words *could not* be taken in one or the other of these senses, in neither case will it follow that *no such thing as unrestricted Omnipotence exists*. If he means *unrestricted by possibilities*, it follows not; for then his argument will either be, 'It is absolutely impossible for certain ends to be produced without certain means, therefore God cannot do all things possible; or else it will be, It is impossible in consistency with the plans of God; that certain ends should be produced without certain means; therefore God cannot do all things possible; in neither of which I can see any consequence. If he mean *unrestricted by impossibilities*, his conclusion does not even then follow, for it is merely an identical proposition; such as, 'a thing cannot be its own contradiction,' 'no man is not a man;' amounting exactly to this, Omnipotence is not impotence; and such a proposition cannot be the conclusion of any reasoning, neither would such a conclusion be pertinent to his purpose or what he aims at establishing, as I have shown above.

But he adds, "power is in its own nature limited. It can act only on possibility." These are as important truisms as this, 'existence is not non-existence.' Power cannot perform impossibilities, for an impossibility, as I have said above, is the contradiction of all power; but how does this prove that God has not unlimited and absolute power?

He goes on to say, "a sweeping Omnipotence which could; by one sovereign act of will, decree that in the nature of things neither impediment nor resistance should exist, leaves no field for power itself to act upon." Does H. W. let me ask, believe that God existed before all things, and therefore before either impediment or resistance existed? Does he believe that there was then no field for power to act upon? On the contrary, does he believe that on that field, which was void either of impediment or resistance, his power called forth the vast and wondrous universe?

The next argument is from the wisdom of God. "But still more, as it respects the wisdom of God, is it absolutely necessary to dismiss the notion of absolute Omnipotence, before the former attribute can shine forth in its true glory. For surely, according to our conceptions, it would be more wise to arrive at once, if that were possible, at all that means, and contrivances,

and processes can accomplish, than to prefer elaborate and circuitous courses, merely for the sake of going round about to do what could be done as well in the twinkling of an eye. And yet in what does the Divine wisdom, as apprehensible by us, consist? Is it not in those very proceedings, which, if unbounded power existed, would be folly and not wisdom, that all the treasures of the infinite mind are exhausted? In adapting means to ends, in pursuing the path of light amid surrounding darkness, in harmonizing discordant principles, and bringing order out of confusion?" This, then, is his argument; 'if unbounded power existed, the adapting of means to ends, &c. would be folly; but the ways of God in adapting means to ends, &c. are not folly; therefore unbounded power does not exist.' The preceding words give us a glimpse of the way in which H. W. with a sagacity that I cannot boast of, satisfied himself of the truth of the saying, "It would be more wise to arrive at once at all that means, &c. can accomplish, than to prefer elaborate and circuitous courses." Suppose, then, that the Almighty were to discard from his economy of the world all the means, contrivances, and processes that H. W. ever contemplated or heard of, and were to arrive at once at all the ends that H. W. conceives them to aim at and accomplish; this, according to H. W. would be a state of things displaying more wisdom than the present system of means, &c. Now let me ask him, does he suppose these ends, or results thus produced, would be of any use or importance, or of none at all; would they exist for any good reason, or for none at all? One of these two must be the case. If they existed for no reason at all, and were of no use or importance at all, this state of things could not display more wisdom than the former, for it could display no wisdom at all. If they did exist for some good reason, and were of any use or importance, they would be manifestly means or contrivances, adapted to an end or ends, and would be exposed to the same objection as the former means, &c.; and therefore, so far from displaying more wisdom than the former system of things, they would display none, but be folly and not wisdom. The assertion, then, that "it would be more wise to arrive at once," &c. and that "if unbounded power existed, the adapting the means to the end, &c. would be folly," are clearly false, since they prove too much, even that Almighty God cannot do any thing for a good reason, or with an end in view, without committing folly.

One merit of H. W.'s dissertation is, that it will equally serve to disprove the wisdom or the goodness of God, by simply substituting the necessary terms, and using the same train of reasoning. Thus for example, putting *w* for *p*, wisdom for power, in the formula, page 811, we thus *prove* that God is not infinitely wise: "Wisdom is in its own nature limited. It can act only on possibilities. Even wisdom itself is but a vague and unintelligible notion, unless displayed to us as triumphing over difficulties and rising superior to obstacles. A sweeping Om-

niscience which could, by one sovereign act of will, decree that in the nature of things, neither impediment nor resistance, neither means nor processes should exist, leaves no field for wisdom itself to act on. Omniscience, such as this, at least supplies no materials for man to comprehend or to adore. No; we are constructed otherwise. Our faculties are so framed as to correspond with the truth and reality of things. They are formed for the contemplation of wisdom as it exists, and not as it does not exist."

The mistake of H. W. in supposing that the employing of means and processes is an argument against the Divine Wisdom, arises from supposing that there are planings, and contrivances, and ends in God's proceedings, resembling our own, and that we could point them out if there were; from fancying that God in any act has only one end in view, without looking beyond it, to which He advances by steps that he takes merely for the sake of that end. Means and ends are notions of our own, drawn from our own wants and weaknesses. If we must employ them at all, we are safest in saying that all his means are ends, and all his ends are means. All his works and ways are the offspring of one thought, and tend to one object; and through them all there is an adorable harmony and unity, of which all his worshippers may be convinced, though it is not to be expected that all, or perhaps that any, should fully understand it. All that is, and all that is going on, while it tends to some great and good result, is itself, if completely contemplated, a result of the same kind as that to which it tends—even such a one as is wonderfully fitted to fill its proper place in the wide scheme of his ways, and to display to those whom he has formed to adore and love him, his awful and lovely perfections.

But the chief argument on which H. W. relies is, that absolute Omnipotence is inconsistent with the Divine goodness. We have here the old question about the existence of evil, with a new solution. The human mind has played more fantastic antics about the untying of this knot than any other, and good reasoners have long given it up as indissoluble. The riddle is however all unriddled, as it seems, and that we need not despair after all, about the squaring of the circle, the philosopher's stone, perpetual motion, &c.; and who knows but that H. W. may make them all out himself? Previous enquirers have generally assumed as indubitable the Omnipotence of God, but have found it hard to reconcile what they see in the world, of evil and suffering, with their notions of the Divine wisdom and goodness. They have never suspected that they were wrong in their notions of Jehovah's 'Eternal Power and Goodness,' thinking with St. Paul, that these are "the invisible things of God that are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood by the things that are made;" but they have confessed with St. Paul, "the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God," that "his judgments" (by

which his distributions of happiness and suffering seem to be signified) "are unsearchable," and "his ways past finding out."

But H. W. has discovered that our notions of the wisdom and goodness of God in his judgments and ways, are clear and right enough, but that we are in error in our conceptions of His power. He cites three texts—Ec. xxiii. 11; Is. vi. 3, 4; Mat. xxiii. 37—8. He asks this question:—"Is this, then, I would ask any fair and candid person, a language which looks as if the All-gracious Being who employs it had any relief or remedy in reserve for those who wilfully reject the mercies he had freely offered them? Are these like the expressions of one who could bestow salvation in any other way, or upon any other terms?" And then he leaves his prostrate antagonist to groan and extricate himself, as best he may, from beneath the weight of this mountain argument—these expressions do not look as if God could save sinners in any other way, or upon any other terms; therefore God *cannot* save sinners in any other way, or on any other terms; and consequently there is no such attribute as absolute Divine omnipotence.

We have here again an excellent formula for disproving the existence of either the infinite power, or the infinite goodness of God. Look at Eph. i. 11; Rev. i. 18; Rev. iii. 7; Rev. iv. 11; Jer. xviii. 6, xv. 2; Matt. xxviii. 18. As thus I *reason*. "Is this, then, I ask any fair and candid person, language which looks as if the Almighty Being who employs it, had any wish to bestow more happiness than He does, or that he had any dislike to the death of sinners? Do these look like the expressions of one who was willing to bestow salvation on any other persons, or in any other way? Is it honouring God to say that he uses a language to work upon our feelings, which language is, in reality, a misrepresentation of the truth; a misrepresentation, nevertheless, so ill contrived, that after all it does not deceive us? Or is it exalting his great name, to magnify the mere moral attributes of his goodness above those natural attributes, in which consist at once both his essence and his glory? No. If it be indeed reverence to God, to dismiss him altogether from our minds, then all such considerations are set at rest for ever. But if it be our duty not only to think of him, but to bear him in all our thoughts, then in all around us we see this truth inscribed, that there is a limit in love, or a limit in power. In which shall we place it? In love? Then we place it not in God, but in his lowest attribute. In power? Then, indeed, we place the limit in God himself; for the right hand of God is the right hand of Power, (Matt. xxvi. 64,) and, therefore, God is Power."

To this *reasoning*, which is just as bad, quite as convincing, and rather more ingenious than that of H. W., I think I hear him replying—"Who told you that the love of God is his lowest attribute, or that his essence and glory consists in his power?" I confess that nobody told me, but that I am merely

talking a little nonsense of my own. And who told H. W., I wonder, that the power of God is his lowest attribute, and that his essence and glory consist in his love? Or who ever dreamed of magnifying one attribute of Deity above another, except himself?

H. W. would not have taken all this pains for our sakes, if he had not had an object in view. What was it? We see what it was in page 810. "If," says he, "it be our prime duty to love God with all our heart, and if we cannot love merely because we are commanded, but must have a clear perception of the amiableness of an object before it is in our power to love it—can it be uninteresting to ascertain whether any character plainly opposite to all our notions of goodness and benevolence, can be warrantably attributed to God? The truth is, that the only rational conclusion we can arrive at in the matter is, that in the nature of things no such attribute can exist; and until the cloud which its supposed existence throws on every procedure of the Divine Providence is dissipated, we must either not think at all, or think amiss on that subject, in comparison of which all other subjects are unimportant, namely, the character of God." To his question I answer—It is altogether unimportant, and the idlest trifling, to ascertain, &c.; for this simple reason, that nobody ever attributed, or is in danger of attributing, such a character to God. Not mankind in general; for to their commonsense there is no repugnancy whatever between infinite power and infinite goodness, not even from the view of the evil there is in the world, which they plainly knew to be in part the voluntary work of man himself, and easily apprehend to be, in part, the means of producing more good than could arise without it. Not philosophers; for although they, pushing their abstractions not only beyond the range of common objects, and common occurrences, but also frequently beyond the range of common sense, find it hard to reconcile their notions of God, in some things, with their notions of goodness, yet they never dream of attributing to God any character plainly opposite to all their notions of goodness and benevolence. Moreover, I deny utterly that the common notions of Divine Omnipotence impose any necessity on us of either not thinking at all, or thinking amiss, of the character of God, and I demand proof from H. W. of the assertion.

I have shown that H. W.'s pains, on this occasion, were perfectly needless. I will now show that he has totally failed in his efforts, were they never so necessary. The Infidel thus reasons: If God were infinite in goodness, as well as infinite in power, no evil would be: but evil is: therefore God is not infinite in goodness. H. W. as far as I can understand him, if he means any thing consistent, any thing that is not the poorest quibbling and trifling, allows the premises, but begs leave to make a slight change in the conclusion, and thus collects, therefore God is not infinite in power. Thus if any one asks why does your good God allow so much misery? The reply is ready—Because he

cannot help it! Was ever any thing more happy? How completely is the cloud now rolled from all the proceedings of Providence! But, unfortunately, another puzzle remains. The present existence of evil is disposed of completely, but how are we to account for its origin at first? Who existed before either evil or any thing else existed? God. Who created all things, and set on foot the whole course of things? God. Then why did he not take his plans better? Thus it seems necessary to sacrifice another attribute, and give up infinite wisdom, as well as infinite power, or else to betake ourselves to the expedient of the ancient Gnostics, and assert the existence of two Gods, a bad one and a good one, that have spoiled each others work.

God forbid that I should attribute to H. W. such blasphemies. He would not more greatly abhor those consequences, than I should abhor charging him with them, or with any other opinion contrary to the Christian faith. I am so deeply convinced of the piety and orthodoxy of that gentleman, that, on this occasion, in spite of the impression of his talents that I have received from the papers he has before contributed to the *EXAMINER*, I am prepared to defend that piety and orthodoxy, at the expense of his perspicuity and prudence.

Rather than believe that the paper I am replying to fairly expresses his serious opinion, I will attribute it to haste, to an excessive love of paradox, to indisposition, or persuade myself that it was sent to press through some mistake or accident. As it has appeared, however, in print, I have thought it my duty to answer it, which I have done, as far as in me has lain, with all fairness, and without the least thought of giving the slightest offence to its elegant and excellent author. And I am convinced that, although it was necessary thus to reply to it, two or three important distinctions, which he has continually confounded, such as between power possessed, and power exercised, and between impossibilities with respect to the agent, and impossibilities with respect to the object, might, with a little charity in interpreting, supply a key to the whole of this strange production, that would explain away nearly all that at first sight may appear hard sayings to the readers of the *CHRISTIAN EXAMINER*.

T. P. K.

A VISION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—I had arrived but the day before in town, from the country, for the purpose of attending certain lectures necessary to qualify me for my intended profession, when, having despatched the important duty of breakfast, I hastened, according to my custom, to the magnificent library of Trinity College. Perhaps there is no luxury on earth greater than that enjoyed by a book-loving student, when he takes his wonted march, with unwearied step, along the thickly-matted floor of that immense building, and finds himself suddenly transported, as by the agency of powerful genii, from the thoroughfares of a noisy metropolis, into the solemn hall of science and silence. What a calm delight steals over his soul, while, as he pursues his lengthy walk beneath that stupendous roof, to keep his assiguation with the folio that awaits him in its unchanging place, the deep recesses open to him on either hand, and exhibit their richly-loaded shelves, a sight he dearly loves, and let upon him the light that streams so holily from beneath the clouds that majestically sail athwart those lofty windows! There the learning of all ages and countries is brought together, and fairly ranged, for his particular pleasure and convenience. Are they not his own, those myriads upon myriads of tomes? Is there any one that has a greater right to them than himself, ever since that memorable moment when, upon his knees, he heard it whispered in his ear, "*In nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, admitto te ad gradum Bacalaureatus in Artibus?*" He has it in his power to bid before him the poets and philosophers of the ancient world, and they rise from their sepulchral slumbers of more than two milleniums, to sing to him their epics, or pronounce their oracles, in tongues unknown to the vulgar, and consecrated to wisdom. He can bid the spirits of that temple fly back through the waste of past ages, and they bring before him, from the gloom of barbarism and superstition, the monk and the alchemist in their mysterious cells, and the frowning castle, with its baron bold. The voluminous scrolls of old historians are ready to fly open at his word, that he may compare the present with the past; and, for him, the deeply-learned and highly-gifted, in distant regions, are recording their researches and their inspirations, which busy fame and laborious art are accumulating in hourly-encreasing treasures at his feet. 'Tis true, he cannot avail himself of all the volumes that are placed at his disposal; but he scarcely thinks of that—he has a vague fancy he shall somehow read and enjoy them all—at least he has not resolved not to read any of them, and they are all plainly within his reach; and thus he has a silent satisfaction in the feeling of his own greatness, which he unconsciously measures by the greatness of his projects.

A want of wholesome exercise blunts the appetite of the mind as well as that of the body, and impairs its powers of exertion and digestion. To say the truth, I had been by no means a read-

ing man for some time previous, and I entered the library that morning in a mood but little propitious to hard study, and without any fixed plan. I strolled lazily from shelf to shelf, pulling out the books here and there as my idle whim dictated from their external appearance. I extricated a huge folio here, for no other reason except that it was a big one and very lightly packed; I took down a quarto there, because it had an unintelligible title, and was of a queer dumpy figure; I scrambled to pull down books, because I could not read their labels, or purely because they were out of my reach. Thus I continued for some time, my idle hand following my capricious eye, that now fixed in this book, and then, as though it had made a sudden discovery, on that, obeying the impulse of a lazy and yet a tantalizing curiosity, that served only to waste my time and put me out of humour. "What shall I read?" said L. "This volume would, doubtless, be interesting enough, if it were not a subject so far from my usual course of studies; that would be very pleasant reading, but of what use is it? Besides, I have not time; I must have a good deal of previous study before I encounter this gentleman; and, as to this, I am not quite *au fait* at the language; and, more provoking still, I cannot read a word of that."

"What shall I read?" I threw my eye along the immense extent of the library, and pulled out my watch, noting the time to a second. I seemed to have a confused notion that I had ten thousand books to read that day, and that I ought to be in a hurry, while, in fact, I was shamefully losing time. A feeling of discomfort came over me; I became fidgetty, finding myself as much at ease as a man whose coat, and boots, and hat, are all too little for him.

"What shall I read?" said I again; and I began, with all the air of a busy student who knows what he is about, briskly to turn over the leaves of the ponderous catalogue; but neither the catalogues nor myself knew what I wanted, and therefore they could give no information. Then I began to call to mind the various books which, when in the country, I had promised myself that I would consult or go through when I came to Dublin; but to fix was impossible. Meanwhile there came across my brain the recollection of several formidable works, the perusal of which I had begun, and which I knew I ought to go on with; and I here thought of my long-cherished purpose of learning Dutch. "I must begin it at some time," said I; "and why not now? Only think what stores of Dutch literature this library contains." This was a pleasant thought, but equally pleasant thoughts of novelties contended for attention and my time. I had a notion of availing myself of the splendid books of prints the library contained, for getting some knowledge of conchology and ichthyology; and it had always been a favourite project of mine to get a clear idea of the abstruse philosophy of Thomas Aquinas and other scholastic geentry. Besides this, I had an intention of reading some of the Byzantine historians, for the sake of seeing what sort of stuff was

the Greek of historians that wrote a thousand years after Christ.

Those pleasant thoughts were, however, quickly interrupted by others that crowded to my mind, of several languages and sciences, the study of which I had begun, but had failed hitherto to prosecute. I was forced to confess how much remained incomplete and disjointed in that knowledge, which I ought perfectly to know—to reflect that I had forgotten much, and that much of what remained was vague and quickly going; and I sighed deeply, when I called to mind my want of application, my injudicious plans, the miserable deficiency of my memory and all my natural powers, that had been so often proved to my mortification; all this, together with the recollection of the little time that yet remained to me of academic privileges, changed my uneasiness to discontentment, my discontentment to self-condemnation, my self-condemnation to despair.

"What shall I do?" said I. I felt myself miserable. "It is impossible to endure this," I said to myself; "but what can I do?" I then called to mind that I had suffered misery of the same kind more than once before, and I saw no prospect of being exempt from it in future. "What am I to do?" The question was unanswerable. I saw but one remedy—but one way of escape—to read no more—to be no longer a student—to make the acquisition of knowledge henceforth a thing of not the least importance. "I will do nothing," said I; "I will not advance an inch farther. Let what I have acquired ooze away as fast as it pleases. I have laboured hard for nearly half a life, and I am only yet a beginner. Neither the time nor the talents allowed to me suffice for the acquisition of learning, or justify me in attempting it."

I felt relieved, and dwelt with pleasure on my new resolution. Argument after argument sprung to my mind to confirm it, and I was prepared to defend its propriety and wisdom against all comers. I began to fight with an imaginary opponent. "Pray, what arguments can you urge to induce me to read?" said I, looking with a dauntless air right in the face of Primate Ussher, whose thoughtful bust was opposite me. "Because the acquisition and possession of knowledge, for its own sake, are delightful to an intellectual being?" "Aye, aye; but the worst of that is, that if the powers of the mind are cultivated, its appetite grows too fast for those powers, and for the means there are of supplying it; and thus the soul is famished instead of fed. Here am I, with a small stock of learning, the acquisition of which has only served to awake within me the cravings of a hunger that can never be appeased; and I am paying dearly for my former feasting, by present famine. I know enough of the sweets of knowledge to look upon the stores of this vast library with gloating eyes, and to wish with equal ardour for the possession of every treasure of wisdom it contains; and yet I cannot indulge my longing by applying to one pursuit, without enduring the multiplied mortification of giving up a thousand others. The moment that is now

dealt out to me must, by great self-denial, be given to one thing; and the next moment is not my own, nor can I hope, at the most, that many more will ever be mine. I have learned to long for what I can never reach; I have learned that I am lost in hopeless ignorance; and the small progress that I have made up the heights of learning has only undeceived me as to the vastness of the mountain before me, and removed the splendid temple and the sunny sky that crown its summit, to a distance immeasurably greater than before."

"Would you urge that it is creditable to be learned, and that industrious study will win the applause of the wise and good? But the feelings of the most honourable emulation, and of the most discerning love of praise, may be easily fanned into the scorching fire of envy, and be quickened to the tortures of a sore and ulcerous pride. Nor is there any need for the bitterness of envy to make you wretched. The persons whose praise you would attain are often the persons it most humbles you to behold; and those whose example most inspires you to imitate them, are those who most strongly prove to you the folly of attempting it. You are humbled by the comparison that is forced on you eternally with the masters that are instructing you; you are discouraged by the very praise of those you seek not to please; and, above all, you see yourself for ever beaten by those that started with you in the race, and thus your littleness chafes and frets under the spur of aspirations, not dishonourable, but disproportionate to your powers. I am not envious nor discontented. Heaven forbid that I should breathe an ungenerous or an ungrateful thought! But there is no need that I should expose myself to the constant temptation of murmuring and envy, and be gratuitously gulled by the bond of mediocrity that confines me."

"But perhaps you will maintain that it is useful. For what is it useful? Does it strengthen or satisfy a man's affections? Does it add a single sweet to the delicious cup of domestic bliss? Does it secure the love of one's fellow-man, or, generally, one's influence over them? Notoriously no! It is of no use in this world, and it is of no use for preparation for a better, nor will be of use to us when we arrive at that better. The earth and all its records will be burnt up, and the questions and disputings of human learning shall be no more; and there is no evidence that any thing we can acquire in this life, except holiness, will fit us for greater happiness in another. What connection is there between the taste and the cravings of the caterpillar for the course green leaf, and the refined appetite of the honey-sipping butterfly? Of what use is the mean art of the crawler, by which he moves his many feet and clings to his little branch, to that nobler creature that spreads its glittering pinions, and roams through the expanse of heaven? To what serves his craft of spinning, be he never so skilful, and be his web never so fine, except to work the shroud and the stinky grave-clothes from which a being of ethereal nature shall afterward spring up, to whom arts so vile shall be both use-

less and unknown? And thus it is with man. His earthly appetites will not exist when, in heaven, he feeds on heavenly food; the reptile's powers and dexterity, which aid him to crawl through this state, would not serve him, even if he could retain them, in his flights and soarings in a better; and all that his art or fancy can spin, suffices but to amuse his insect-life, and write on himself a soon-forgotten epitaph."

I looked upon the busy students that were scattered here and there reading, and I pitied them. "They think themselves happy," said I; "but we shall see them forced, by the librarian's bell, to call back their thoughts from their distant sublimities and profundities, and turned out unceremoniously into the vulgar crowd. And surely the life of the luckiest student is nothing better than a little hour in Trinity College Library, from which he is summoned, too soon and too suddenly, by the dreadful toll of death."

Determined to enjoy the emancipation I had bestowed on myself, I reclined myself, in the easiest posture I could assume, upon a seat at the extremity of the library, with my eyes fixed full on a window that overlooks the park, and abandoned my thoughts to the capricious direction of fancy, who began, as is her manner, to shape out of the empty air a thousand grotesque figures, and unmeaning forms. After a confused reverie of some time, I heard a sudden, but not a loud, noise at the window opposite to me, which seemed to vibrate, in the strangest way possible, through every pane, producing an effect on the ear totally different from any thing that I had ever heard before. While I was wondering what could have occasioned it, I perceived two folios on different shelves move slowly out of their places, and throw themselves open, and turn over their leaves in the air, without any thing to support them. In breathless astonishment, I watched them remain thus suspended for a while, and then go quietly back into their places; and on looking up, I saw, with redoubled amazement, that a number of other books, of various sizes, were also in motion, some of which, after giving a few tumblers in the air, and flourishing their leaves, popped quickly back again, while others remained hanging nearly at rest. My hair began to rise under my hat, when my attention was drawn to a quarto, heavy and high enough to injure a person seriously if it were to fall on him, which, with dilating eyes, I observed slowly advancing towards me; and when it had come just over me, it closed, and descended rapidly through the air; but before I could give a sign of terror, I felt a delicate hand passing upon my eyes, which, while it remained there, did not remove the light, but caused an exquisite cloud of pale violet brightness to pass through them, as it were, into the very depths of my brain, and there playing for two or three seconds, to search and illuminate, as it appeared to me, my inmost soul.

When the hand was removed, I saw an angelic being at my side. In his eye there was a sweetness inexpressible, and about his

mouth and chin there played a something of high-born grandeur that gave him an air of more than princely majesty, while his high and snowy forehead told that thoughts had their dwelling there, for which there is only room in few created minds.

"Child of mortality," said he, with a seraphic smile, "I am thy friend. Why art thou loitering? Hast thou more moments to waste than the rest of thy race?" I then ventured to tell him how I was dismayed by the number, the extent, and the difficulty of the departments of knowledge; how painful it was for me to be continually wishing in vain, and reminded of my weakness, by my own failures and by the success of others; and how disappointments, mortifications, and defeats, the imperious demands of daily life, and the incessant fear of death, had broken my spirit, and made me resolve to seek wisdom, in this state of being, no more, but to wait for the greater lights and assistance of the future. He threw on me a look of compassion and benevolence, and replied, "I have heard thy murmurings and thy reasonings, and I will now give thee a glimpse of the way in which knowledge is pursued, both by superior nature and by thine own race, in the bliss of heaven."

Again he placed his hand upon my eyes, and again the lovely light flashed with increased intensity through the secret chambers of my brain, adding tenfold strength and sensibility to the powers of vision. I then looked and saw before me a number of celestial youths, some of them more noble, or grave, or intelligent, than others, in their looks, but all exquisitely lovely. They were standing or walking about in that quarter of the library, or hanging, like hovering swans, gracefully in the air, reading and consulting different books. I looked on them with awe and admiration; but my angelic friend stopped me from putting my inquiries, by bidding me kneel upon the fold of his robe that he arranged for me, and then passing it round my body, and seizing me by the right arm, he beckoned to one of the spirits, who softly let down the window, through which we passed like lightning, he holding me so that I was perfectly at my ease. When we had reached the upper regions of the air, he moved more slowly, yet still at a rate a hundred times as quick as a swallow—a rapidity almost too great for me to bear, notwithstanding the care of the angel in carrying me, although, as I learned afterwards, it was little else than a snail's pace to him. As we flew along, we seemed to be going always through a crowd of celestials like those I had seen; in such numbers did we meet them, ascending and descending, and crossing our path with their dazzling robes, and presently vanishing, like meteors, from my bewildered sight. "What means this surprising concourse?" I asked. "'Tis nothing unusual," he replied: "the ministrations between earth and heaven, and between world and world, cease not day nor night; the whole universe swarms with legions of spiritual beings; and every orb, that whirls and flashes with living energy in its appointed course, is accompanied with their thousands of thousands, roaming at

freedom, with different objects, or joyously executing the commands of the Eternal. But of these things thou canst now know no more than a very small part, such as may serve for the lesson I intend thee to learn."

In a few minutes we alighted on the shore of a vast and beautiful lake, which, he told me, was the lake of Geneva; where he left me, and vanished from my sight, bidding me contemplate for a few moments, till he should return, the scene before me. It was a solitary part of the shore, of ravishing beauty. Before me was the lake, that receptacle of a hundred streams, the daughters of a hundred mountains, which had danced and sparkled for many a league of a headlong and mirthful course from their Alpine fountains, that they might here join their clear waters, and, yoking their sister-waves, drive freely and gracefully along its wide and peaceful surface. It was adorned with every variety of shore, with pebbly strands and hanging woods, with rugged rocks and sloping lawns; far in the distance were awful forests, and farther still the snow-capped Alps; while immediately around me were the charms of sunshine, flowers, and verdure, the notes and airy play of birds, and the hum of insect-happiness.

But the pomp and beauty of nature were as nothing in comparison with the vision that my eyes, strengthened by that celestial touch, now revealed to me. I beheld crowds of seraphic creatures in the air, on the earth, and the water. Some were seizing and dismissing unharmed the birds and insects; others were reclining on the green sod, or stationed on the waving trees; while others, again, were busy in the waters of the lake, ascending from its depths, or plunging into them, or gracefully reclining upon its glassy bosom; all seemed happy and busily occupied, whether lost in solitary thought, or engaged in earnest conversation.

My bright friend quickly returned, bearing in his hand a few mean-looking plants; and I asked him what those angels were doing. "They," he replied, "are happy spirits, from various worlds, who, having completed their earlier state of discipline and probation, and having entered upon the freedom of immortality, are employed, in the intervals of more weighty occupations, in exploring the inexhaustible wonders of creation. In scenes like this, where nature is most lovely, and man most remote, they are always present, and in companies more or less numerous, thus engaged."

"And is it, then, true," I exclaimed, "what I have so often fancied, that the power and skill of the Great Builder of all things are not lavished in vain over the face of our world; but that, while man is both unable and unwilling to enjoy their ministrations, there are yet nobler beings that do enjoy them? Often have I felt the most painful discontent and disappointment, when, finding myself surrounded with the sublime processes and powers of Nature, I have reflected upon my unfitness to contemplate them. I have thought—how weak are my powers! how am I repulsed and excluded at every point! how cold and impure are

my affections! how scanty my leisure! how brief my uncertain life! And I have asked, are there no other worthier spectators of all this glory? It would be absurd—it would be impious to think it.”

“It would, indeed, be absurd,” replied he; “but in man it is ignorance, not impiety. Be assured that there is no creature, whether animate or inanimate, to which God has given a being, a character, and a place in his creation, that does not interest and elevate seraphic minds. The natural history of this little creature,” continued he, detaining a little insect that was sporting past us in the sunshine, “if written out to the extent to which heavenly science has brought it, would fill more volumes than all that the dreamings or discoveries of human naturalists have filled. That angelic youth whom thou seest lost in thought, in that huge oak, could pronounce a lecture such as no mortal can imagine, about its structure, its habits, its arts of providing for its support and defence, its loves, its fears, the secrets of its growth through several states, the rearing of its young, and a thousand other curious things, in which it is different from every being in the universe besides. He could point out the beautiful analogies by which it is connected to other departments of nature in this and in many distant worlds, none of which are accidental, or merely fanciful, but which have been designed by the Almighty, and made out by wondering and delighted thought. If that species of insect were to be annihilated, it would be like a bruise given to a mirror, that sends innumerable cracks in all directions; it would spoil the symmetry of creation, and produce a perceptible defect in the harmony of the celestial spheres. Be assured, I say, that there is no part, however minute, either in this or any other orb, whether sun or planets, that menial students are not constantly employed upon, with ever increasing zest, each one gaining continually a wider and a still wider view of the highly finished work that Eternal Perfection has called out of nothing, who alone can, with one glance, survey and search through the whole, which, vast and glorious as it is, He yet esteemeth but as the shadow of an atom in his sight!”

“If this be so,” I observed, “if the scenes of this earth are haunted by beings so beautiful, pure, and wise as these, how mean are the fancies of human poets, when compared with the reality! What poor puppets were the much regretted trains and choirs of the ancient mythology; whose waters were peopled with the Naiads and Nereids; whose woods were haunted by Fauns and Dryads; on whose mountains danced the graceful Oreads, and in which the trees of the grove were fabled to conceal each its lovely Hamadryad! How ignorant are those who lament that the reign of the Muses and rural deities has passed away!”

“And yet,” the angel answered, “these efforts of fancy are not to be despised; for they have a foundation in truth. Man, as he walks among the wonders of creation, not only feels that it

is a theatre of treasures that he cannot arrange and examine, but also that it is a sanctuary too pure and holy for him to tread, and, confessing in his heart that his title of Lord of Nature is but a mockery, he frames to himself the idea of nobler existences to preside over and to inhabit it. He has a vague consciousness that such beings must be around him, and yearnings arise within him to converse with them; but, alas! such yearnings are now but the efforts of a wing that has been clipped, or a limb that has been withered! It might have been otherwise; and the legions of the celestials once hoped it would have been otherwise. When their myriads exulted at the completion of the six days' work, and raised those rapturous cheers that shook the distant stars in their courses, it was not only at the sight of that fair new world that flashed along before them, in her voyage through the sunshine, but it was to see the planting of another race of creatures, that were to know and adore their common Father, with whom they were to hold the communion of purest friendship; to whom, as their beloved pupils, they were to impart their own high thoughts and knowledge, and the bud of whose faculties they were gradually to unfold to the beams of truth and the warmth of love, while they watched their expanding minds, as they laboured with encreasing strength to express their amazement and gratitude. Ah! little canst thou conceive the shock of sorrow that ran through the paradises of angelic beings, when this planet became the victim of sin, and suffering, and death! Since then, a cloud from hell has hid the heavenly world from mortals, and they remain, and must remain, strangers to those for whose communion they are too impure; although the earth, retaining yet, in most of her features, the beauty of her natal morning, is ever attended, in her courses round the sun, by millions of those beings, exploring and adoring amid her beauties and her wonders; who are ever and anon alighting on spots such as this, where man and his works seldom or never appear; for these spirits love not the sounds of evil passions, nor the breath of unholy desires."

I had sunk upon the ground as the angel was speaking. I felt all the impurity of my nature; I looked upon myself as a deformity and a pollution on the face of the fair creation. If His creatures be thus pure and thus remote from the spirit of me and my race, what must He be whom they worship? This thought pierced me to the soul; I hid my face, and, with tears of humbled and repenting pride, I smothered an impious wish that rose within me, to be a worm or a weed, that I might attract the attention of those happy beings. The kind spirit pitied my distress. "It is not my office to teach thee," said he, "that there are those among the children of mortality whom angels love, and that thou mayst become one of them thyself. The occupations of blest spirits are different, nor is any one always employed in the same way. Enough is revealed to thee already about the interest that heaven takes in thy race—about the joy that exalts in its blest abodes when a sinner repenteth—and about

the ministering spirits that are sent forth, on errands that I cannot make known to thee, to the heirs of salvation. My lesson to thee now is of something useful, indeed, to thee, but of infinitely less consequence to thee than what is made known to thy fellow-men in that wondrous Testament of Him whom I adore."

While he was speaking, a new train of the sons of light were seen hovering near us, and, with countenances of sparkling gladness, surveying the scene, and busily conversing. I demanded who they were? "They are a company of heavenly students," said he, after a few moment's pause, "whom I know to have lately arrived at the earth, to amuse and instruct themselves. From their conversation, I discover that they have just arrived from the Isle of Borneo, to settle a question that has arisen among them, about a curious analogy there is between the minute structure of the brain of a beetle there, and that of a little creature which is very common here, and which I now see upon your hand." I looked at my hand, but I could neither feel nor see any thing. He smiled, and continued: "It will be some ages before your opticians can invent an instrument to enable them to see it, if they advance no faster than they are now doing; and yet the creature is as complex and curious to my eyes, as your own frame is to yours. About two thousand years ago, I remember that the same analogy struck me, and that the tracing of it through a number of other creatures entertained me exceedingly; but these are only young students in this world."

"How long have they been here?" I enquired.

"Since first they alighted on this orb," returned the angel, "your planet has made about three hundred and thirty revolutions round the sun."

"Three hundred and thirty years of investigation with the powers of a seraph!" I exclaimed; "and they are still young students! Why, empires have arisen and passed away; the greater part of the world has been discovered, and the whole face of it changed; and almost every thing that man knows about it has been found out since that period!"

"It is only an hour in the life of an immortal," he replied. "During that period, which seems so long to thee, except a short interval when they were called away by one of the public solemnities that regularly recur in the arrangements of heaven, they have been surveying the various forms of animated life in this world, and more than that period must elapse before they can know as much as the genius who is now entering into conversation with them knows. He is, at this moment, explaining to them the point they are in doubt about, and showing them the brain of one of those animalcules that has just expired. They are now departing; they are gone; and, by this time, they are in the Isle of Borneo."

"What!" demanded I, in amazement, "can they have travelled half round the world in three seconds?"

"They are but slow travellers," he answered. "Spirits advance

continually in their powers of glorifying and serving God; and there are innumerable degrees of the acquirements to which they have arrived. Many of us can outstrip the solar rays in their flight; but those angels cannot move with the hundredth part of the rapidity of light. Let me observe, however, that the power of rapid motion is but a trifle in comparison with the other facilities that immortals have for acquiring wisdom, and improving in the knowledge of God and his boundless works."

"Doubtless," said I, "when those genii arrived on this planet, they possessed great knowledge, which they had previously acquired in other parts of the creation, and which would enable them to understand and explain what they met with there."

"Thou hast conjectured rightly," he replied: "these spirits passed the period of their probation, and entered upon the freedom of immortality in a region of the universe far distant from this." "How far?" I asked. "Your boldest astronomers have no conception of the distance," he answered. "Your earth has made nearly a million of revolutions round that central orb, since it was first launched in space; yet if it had been moving in a direct line ever since that moment to the present hour, at double its present speed of nineteen miles a second, it would only have described a very small portion of the distance from where we stand to the birth-place of those immortals." "Then, of course," I observed, "their age must be equally out of the reach of my capacity."

"It is," rejoined he; "and still they pass but for striplings in heaven; for the difference between their age and that of the lowest archangel, goes as far beyond their ideas as their age goes beyond thine."

"Why should they have visited this planet at all, I wonder?" said I. "They," returned he, "like myriads upon myriads of other heavenly intelligences, are ranging at will, from system to system, from sun to sun, from planet to planet; and everywhere searching out and enjoying the ever-varying works of the Eternal; and, some time ago, they arrived at your sun, where they would most likely have still remained for a thousand years to come, if they had not been impatient to see this world, which has acquired a renown, from the mysterious visit: which the adorable Son of God made to it; which rings through the depths of heaven, and makes other worlds, to which it would seem as a little satellite, to be almost forgotten in comparison of it." "How is it possible," I enquired, "that a being who is acquiring knowledge for ages, should not either be satisfied with it, or forget it?" "Neither is possible," he replied. "The energies of immortality are ever young and growing; for there is no fear of old age, nor of disappointment, or surprise by death, to damp them; and all the blest have this common privilege, that they never forget what they have once learned; but the acquisition of an eternity will be easily stored and remem-

bered; while eternity shall never cease to furnish fresh subjects of thought, and reveal new truths and beauties that shall recall what has been known before, and sweetly harmonize with all." "Am I, then, to understand," said I, "that eternity will be too short for an archangel to know even the material world? That the counsels of God, and the mysteries of life and thought, should remain to all a depth unsearchable, I can conceive; but are the mere laws, and positions, and motion of matter to puzzle eternally even the alchymists of heaven?" "Even so," he answered; "as far, at least, as I can judge, both the minuteness and the magnitude of creation are equally unexplored by finite minds, and will remain so: none but one can understand every thing about that blade of grass. The being that could solve every question concerning it, to whom there should be no mystery whatever in its history, would be able to make another, but creation is the work of God above. I need not tell thee, that there can be no comparison of earthly and heavenly science; but so wondrous are the power and wisdom of Jehovah, that the meanest structure on which His word has stamped perfection in its kind, affords room for never-ending admiration and discussion to his creatures. As to the magnitude and extent of His works—of His natural works alone, I can only say this, that though I am a spirit more ancient than yonder sun, and than many of the stars that mortals can behold, and though I have visited regions far beyond the faintest glimmer that your telescopes have discovered, I know them not. I know archangels of a rank unspeakably above mine, who have gone forth on voyages, into the depths of space, moving with thrice the lightning's rapidity, and who, after thousands of ages, have returned more amazed, more dismayed than ever, at the works of the Unsearchable. The great ministers of his commands, that are continually flying through his empire, frequently meet with others, as great as themselves, whom they have never seen before; and it often happens, that when these brother princes pause awhile in their meteor-course, to hold sublime and affectionate communion, they exchange information about what each has seen and known of the same Omnipotent Power, that opens in their bosoms new springs of astonished love and admiration; and whithersoever they urge their flight, they tell, with godlike eloquence, the wonders they have learned; and the imperishable palaces of heaven are thrown into a new ferment—its countless armies cast themselves before the Eternal Majesty, in vanquished silence, and worship ineffable; or they are inspired to sing a new strain of triumphant praise, a strain that is caught from world to world, with burning enthusiasm, waking echoes that shall never be silenced, as it runs through all the borders of habitable space, and raising up an offering acceptable to the ear of Him who dwelleth unapproached in His temple of eternity! I know not any being that can tell where are the limits that separate created bliss and beauty from empty nothingness, save

Him whose hand swept round the compass that described them : nor dare I promise myself that the immortality which lies before me shall enable me to grasp that ever-receding secret, although I am convinced that those limits must be finite."

"It is all in vain for me to struggle with thoughts like these," I observed, in a tone of despondency ; "I cannot soar away from this earth, or see it dwindle into its due proportions ; but still, on all sides its interminable plains and seas intercept my vision, and what to you is but an atom, to me appears almost the universe. And, doubtless," I added, "the notions which mankind have of the size of this planet, as compared with the rest of the creation, are not more erroneous than their notions of its age in comparison with other worlds. That this earth, with the sun and system to which it belongs, is much more ancient than the race of man, is, I think, proved beyond all contradiction ; nor can I see that the supposition is inconsistent with the Book of Revelation ; but I speak not of the duration of the present state of things merely ; I am prepared to learn, without surprise, that the whole period of this world's existence is very short, when contrasted with the antiquity of other worlds." "Thou conjecturest rightly," the angel replied. "The ages of man's generation are but an hour in the reckoning of heaven ; and the whole history of this orb's different stages is as a state of yesterday ; for your system is the most recent of any in this part of Jehovah's empire.

"It would be well if your philosophers were more aware of this, as it might save them from a great deal of trouble that they give themselves, to vindicate, as they term it, the character of God from the objections that the deluge of sin and wretchedness which has swept over your world, seems to charge it with. They will one day smile at their narrow notions, when they shall learn that the ruin of one race, and the miseries of a small planet, are but like the vanishing shadow that one solitary little cloud, in the course of a long summer's sunshine, should cast for a moment, and no more, on the top of a single hill ; or like a solitary leaf-bud, which, of all that blossoms in these Alpine forests, or the vales beneath them, should be the only one that failed to reach perfection. The fall, the redemption, and the restoration of mankind, will be in the annals of eternity but as the brief history of a moment—yet of a moment of memorable and everlasting consequences. And all that was ever suffered through the wide dominions of Eternal Goodness, bears to the happiness he has bestowed on the countless objects of His care, a proportion infinitely too small to be calculated. And yet it is not for me to speak of the future ; nor can any created being foretell how far this frightful infection of sin and rebellion that has appeared, not only in earth, but once before in the heavenly region, may proceed. God knoweth—adored be His name, and trusted for evermore.

"Thou knowest, mortal, through whose might and mercy thou

mayest thyself escape. On that subject, to which all others are less than nothing to thee, it is not mine to instruct thee; nor out of that danger can I, or all the legions of the skies, deliver thee."

I sent forth a prayer to Him who is exalted a Prince and a Saviour, and in deep humiliation and contrition I called on that name in which the sinner finds his only refuge and consolation.

After a short pause, I ventured to remind my condescending instructor of his promise to teach me something of the way in which the blessed departed pursue the search for knowledge. "There are many things," said I, "that I would fain learn, about the place they are in, the enjoyments and occupations that fill up their time, the interest they feel in their former selves, and in the state of the world they have left behind them." "There are but few things," he observed, interrupting me, "that it is lawful for me to declare to thee, or becoming in thee to ask about. What is permitted to be made known I will briefly inform thee of. Learn, then, that the thirst for knowledge remains, and becomes a hundred-fold stronger after death; nor is it ungratified; for the redeemed have in paradise facilities of improvement that surpass what they had on earth, nearly as far as the bliss of heaven excels the bliss of earth; and yet they will not receive their full power and freedom to range through the magnificence of creation, till after the consummation of this world's destiny, when their spirits shall assume their glorious vehicles.

"Till then they remain where they now are, engaged in the exercise of happy affections and contemplations, and blest with the friendship and instruction of angels, legions of whom have it for their delightful office to be their teachers and companions. The most interesting object of thought to those who love the acquisition of knowledge is, as might be expected, their own native world, to and from which, since they have not themselves access to it, their angelic friends are incessantly flying, to assist their studies and gratify their enquiries. If, for instance, any one wishes to know what an author has said on any subject, and the book of that author is not accessible to him, he can either learn it from the lips of some good spirit near him, or need only to express his wish, and a bright messenger takes a rapid bound to the world of mortals, seeks out the book, and quickly returns with every syllable unerringly fixed for ever in his memory." "Ah, then," I exclaimed, "the radiant youths I saw in the library were messengers from some glorified children of Adam; perhaps from some who once trod the floor of that library, with wishes and feelings like my own!" "Right," he answered, "as to some of them; others, however, were reading for their own pleasure and information." "What?" said I, "can angels care to read the work of mortals?" "They are curious to know every thing that can be known," he answered, "about the actions and thoughts of men; and accordingly, there never

was a book written by them that has not been perused, and that could not be correctly repeated at this moment by many of the sons of light; nor is there a single hour in all the history of your world, of which a most minute history could not be obtained from angelic observers." "Can you make material objects invisible," I enquired, "as well as remain invisible yourselves?" "No," he replied. "How is it then, I wonder," said I, "that the changes and motions that angels produce in the substances they handle, are not more frequently observed by us, as I observed the motions of the books in the library!" "Oh!" said he, "there is nothing more easy than for us to guard against your observation; nor would the books have been touched while thy eyes were on them, if I had not wished it. I had heard thy reasonings and thy foolish resolution, and I condescended to read thee this lesson. Dost thou understand its meaning?" "I do, and I trust that, by God's merciful help, I shall commit such folly no more. I see that there is no need for me to distress myself at the prospect of death, as though he were a scourging tyrant that would snatch away from me all the means of knowledge. I see that the extent of the department of science ought not to dispirit me, since seraphs themselves see no end to the course of varied learning through which Eternal Wisdom is leading them. I see that to him who is living for heaven, the longings for intellectual acquisition can never be threatened with disappointment, from the shortness of life, or the want of powers and assistances, nor suffer more than a mere momentary interruption from the less dignified or less delightful occupations of life. Henceforth I will banish all impatience, and contenting myself with the leisure that my duties allow me, and calmly giving up my thoughts to the subject that now invites them, accustom myself to look forward with a certain hope, to a state of greater powers and leisure, in which I may address myself to every other pursuit that can delight the intellect or the imagination. And, above all, I trust that I shall never murmur at the poverty of my talents, or compare myself discontentedly with others. This I always knew to be sinful, but, till now, I never saw all the folly of it; for I perceive that even angels, as well as mortals, differ in their endowments, and are yet all advancing onwards to those heights of excellence which are already attained by those before them."

"Beware, however," said the angel, "of imagining that in learning something of the way in which knowledge is pursued in the celestial regions, thou hast gained anything more than a faint perception of the smallest part of their employments and happiness. Those are regions not only of thought, but of action, of love, and of worship. The joy that flows from the acquisition of knowledge is far surpassed by the joy of action in honorable embassies and benevolent ministrations; this happiness is again inferior to that which is yielded by the affections of eternal friendship and brotherly love among characters of all

diversities of excellence and honor; and ennobling and exceeding all, is the bliss that is felt in the perception and adoration of the ever-present God. All other delights of heaven, the eloquence of seraphim may describe; but this, though felt by all, is by all unsearchable; and in the full stream of immortality's pleasures, whether of holding communion with nature in her inmost and holiest shrine, or of bending every energy to some great work of benevolence or dignity, or of deathless friendship's anticipations and recollections—in the midst of all, this consciousness of a God present in all his love and majesty, as his own portion for ever, rushes like a spring tide of extacy to the worshipper's heart, making that heart a temple before which the very heavens are profanity, and he sinks down all conquered and amazed, as though that thought had never before opened upon him its too o'erdazzling brightness. And now, for this time, I have given thee a sufficient glimpse of the world of happy spirits: go to thy dwelling, and meditate on what thou hast learned. I see a signal in the moon, (whose pale crescent was scarcely visible in the brightness of the solar light,) that tells me of a brother angel's arrival there this moment, with whom I have agreed to meet, in order to carry on an investigation into the nature of a subtle ethereal fluid, in which we expect to be assisted by an experiment on these little mountain plants and a mineral substance in the moon. This spirit," he continued, beckoning to a heavenly being that was near, "will convey thee home." The angel then vanished, and immediately the other threw part of his robe over me, and taking me by the arm, mounted swiftly into the higher regions. We had not proceeded far, when I was horrified to find myself seized rudely by the leg, and pulled almost from the grasp of the angel! I felt that an evil demon had laid his hand upon me!—he was tearing me from my protector's hold, that he might dash me in pieces;—with a pang of mortal agony, I felt myself going—I fell through the depths of æther, down—down—down—and in a moment I saw the assistant-librarian shaking me by the leg and shoulder, and I heard him say, "the bell has rung, and the doors are about to be closed."

T. P. K.

THE SERMON OF A ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP CONTRARY TO HIS CHURCH AND CREED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—Events have frequently occurred in our own day, which prove the truth of the Apostle's declaration, "that men hold the truth in unrighteousness," now, as well as in ancient times.

There are religious teachers who either revile or mutilate the Sacred Oracles—who change the glory of the incorruptible God into images made of wood, of stone, and of dough—who worship and serve the creature—yea, things of their own formation, rather than the Creator—and yet, in contradiction to their creeds and councils, not unfrequently deliver, in their addresses, the plain and unsophisticated truths of the Gospel of Jesus.

On the 1st inst. I heard the Rev. Dr. Murray, the Romish Archbishop, preach a Charity Sermon in Townsend-street Chapel. His text was, "And taking a child, he set him in the midst of them, and when he had embraced him, he said to them, whosoever shall receive one such child as this in my name, receiveth me." (Mark ix. 36, 37.) I give the text as repeated from memory by the preacher, the words not corresponding with the Douay version sanctioned by Dr. Murray and his brother bishops. In the sermon he avoided all allusion to the two preceding verses, although so intimately connected with the motto of his discourse; probably he had the sagacity to discern that they contained a rebuke to the evil spirit of supremacy, and therefore, "*he held his peace.*" After some preliminary remarks, he observed that the verses suggested two ideas, "to consider Jesus, first as a Saviour, and secondly as a Judge." In speaking of Christ as a Saviour, the Doctor said, "Let us contemplate that Being who dwells in everlasting and ineffable Majesty, who is incapable of receiving any increase of happiness from the homage of ten thousand worlds—who became incarnate that he might make a *full atonement* for sin; and consider on the other hand, the utter inability of man, or of *all created beings*, to make *that atonement.*—Jesus, the Divine and Eternal Word, without any interest of his own, but moved by unspeakable love towards sinners, became flesh, and offered himself an atonement for sin, *which no created mortal could effect—an atonement of infinite value.*"

Does this correct description, which is given of the person and work of Jesus, comport with that image of jealousy, the god of the mass, which a few moments before was elevated by the officiating priest, for the homage and the hope of the assembled congregation? Did the broaden god, which every Roman Catholic is taught to believe to be Christ, verily and truly display a particle of that effulgence of glory and ineffable majesty which the Doctor declared belongs to Jesus, and which cannot be separated from him. And as the Lord Jesus has made an

atonement for sin, which is "full," and of "infinite value," why are we told that the "mass is a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice." Are there two modes of propitiation? Again, "Jesus was born in want; he lived in toil, and died in agony; that through his humiliation and sufferings we might escape the Divine wrath." Does not this language repudiate and annul all the ministrations of Priests? If the Doctor believe what he has so plainly affirmed, that the atonement of Jesus was "full and of infinite value," there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin: what is full and infinite cannot admit of increase. But while the doctrine thus proclaimed by this Divine of the Church of Rome, is in perfect accordance with the whole tenor of Scripture, it is in complete and total opposition to the Council of Trent, which declares the man to be accursed who affirms "that sins are remitted for the sake of Christ; or that it is by that *trust alone* we are justified." Doctor Murray has incurred this penalty, if sincere in what he has asserted, and so has an Apostle of whose sincerity there can be no doubt; who writes, "being justified freely (without cause) by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Here we have Doctor Murray versus all the *learned* Doctors of Trent; and the Council of God which makes known the perfections of Jehovah, and the sufficiency of the salvation of Jesus, against the Tridentine Council.

In the second place, Jesus was considered in the character of a judge. After expatiating on the terrors of the last day, he said, "But I will remind you briefly of another day, the thought of which should strike us with deeper awe, because it may be nearer—a judgment less solemn, but not less terrible in its effects—a judgment at which the same all-seeing Judge will pass the *same inexorable* sentence. I refer to that judgment which every human being must undergo the moment of the soul's separation from the body, and to which St. Paul refers when he says, "it is appointed for men once to die, and after death the judgment."

Here we have a complete and total renunciation of the doctrine of Purgatory. The same inexorable sentence being passed at the particular, as shall be at the general judgment; wherefore the necessity of masses and purgatorial societies, for the deliverance of the departed from penal fire. If the Doctor believe that Jesus is verily offered in the mass, whenever he officiates, although ostensibly for the repose of souls he asserts at death have their destiny irretrievably fixed, is he not guilty of an act more criminal than the Jews, because he, in the mass, needlessly sacrifices the Son of God, whereas the Jews, in crucifying the Lord of Glory, were but fulfilling the Divine purposes? And if, in his own mind, he is persuaded that Jesus is not offered in the mass, its celebration being but a mere harmless ceremony, he is guilty of a sin of equal magnitude, involving the worshippers in the guilt of idolatry. It is, however, needless further to pursue the subject, as the hints thus hastily thrown out will,

no doubt, suggest many more to your readers; and above all, they must come to the self-evident conclusion, that Doctor Murray must be either under the influence of a curiously constructed mind, or drunk with the spiritual wine of the Babylonish harlot; who, while he thus describes the "falseness" and "infinite value of the atonement," continues to countenance a system which denies, at every step, the efficacy of the sacrifice of Jesus, the oneness of his mediation, and the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit.

I am, Sir, your Constant Reader, but

No JESUIT.

Dec. 1838.

ON THE USE OF GIFTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—I have observed in the December Number of the EXAMINER, an article on the Use of Gifts, by T. G. This article professes to be a review of a book, entitled "The Use of Gifts;" and as it charges the author with certain things which he is unwilling to admit, he trusts, therefore, that you will kindly give insertion to a few observations, which he hastens to make in his own defence, and for the instruction of T. G.

And first, in the kindest spirit, I would ask T. G. what part of the pamphlet entitled "The Use of Gifts," 'denounces a regular ministry as a remnant of Popery?' I am not aware of having used any such declaration; but I have insinuated that an undue veneration of clerical office is a remnant of Popery.—See Use of Gifts, page 39.

Again T. G. has said, "we let pass many fine opportunities of mortifying our *adversary*." That I am the adversary of T. G. is more than I am aware of. If he regards himself as a Christian, I have addressed myself to Christian brethren; and how I became his adversary is to me a mystery, except it be in the sense that Paul became the adversary of the Galatians,—“am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?”

Alluding to the following passage, T. G. says, "why thus handle the Word of God deceitfully?" "The human body has many members, but all have not the same office; so the Church at Rome was composed of many members, but all had not the same office; nevertheless they had offices, as is obvious from the passage, 'according to their gifts.' Having, then, gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophecy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation." Is it "handling the Word of God deceitfully" to speak so? I think it must be obvious to

every good judge of language, that there is no handling of the Word of God decentfully here.

Again, T. G. writes—"Our author should have drawn out his subject from the folds of ambiguous phraseology." I would here ask him, why has he not, as an honest reviewer, and as a proper critic, given a specimen of the ambiguous phraseology he complains of? Or why has he not referred to the page where it might be seen? as assertion without proof will never be regarded in courts of equity.

But indeed almost the whole of this review reminds me of a Roman Catholic whom I once heard in debate with Mr. Daly of Powerscourt, in the Trade's Hall, Glasgow. Mr. Daly, with logical acumen and manly vigour, drove the advocate of Popery out of his refuges of lies; consequently, the Roman Catholic found himself in a great strait to maintain any ground; and like one greatly agitated through fear of shame, he began to throw out many uncharitable and strange reflections, aside from the subject in debate. So, I believe, T. G. has found the arguments in the book he has attempted to review, too firmly based to be set aside, therefore, he has taken the ground of a Roman Catholic, and thrown out many unnecessary reflections, coloured with sarcastic humour, scarcely worthy of a Christian. And thus, like an unwise painter, he has bespattered himself and others for no good purpose.

But, Sir, I should now allow "The Use of Gifts" to speak for itself, by giving a few quotations from it, exhibiting its leading arguments, but there being a cause, I forbear, and only state, that my principles, as set forth in "The Use of Gifts," require only to be examined with judgment and candor, and I am sure it will appear that they are legitimately drawn from the Word of God, and that I have not used sophistry, nor wrested any passage of Scripture out of its fair and legitimate meaning. I have plainly stated, that there should be pastors in the Church, as well as annexed my reasons for such a statement. I have also pleaded that there should be exhortation among Christian brethren; and I do not see why T. G. should say it is unfair to plead for exhortation, when the Scriptures again and again enjoin it.

I plead that every Church should follow the pattern given in the New Testament as far as they can; and if T. G. can show me why there should not be, when there can be, what the Scriptures enjoin, I will be more wise afterwards.

With every kind feeling to T. G., I would now take my leave of him; and should this communication find a place in your EXAMINER, I shall, Sir, be in gratitude bound to regard you with that respect which is due to an obliging and liberal Editor.

A. H.

THE PALATINE SETTLEMENTS IN IRELAND.

LETTER TO DEAN MURRAY.

Newcastle, County of Limerick, Dec. 1833.

MY DEAR SIR,—Some years since you expressed a wish that I should endeavour to trace the history of the Palatine Settlements, as they are commonly called. I have not forgotten your request; although the tediousness of the subject has deterred me from consulting traditional testimony, which is chiefly necessary in the investigation; for I am not aware that any important documents respecting their location are extant. I shall be very happy if the few particulars hereafter stated, should add to your acquaintance with the history and habits of that interesting people, who, distributed in scattered hamlets, frequently in remote districts, and encompassed by an unsympathizing population, have retained with singular fidelity, through the lapse of more than a century, their alien habits, and even characteristic complexion and feature; for intermarriages with the people of the country are studiously discountenanced amongst them. Their language is indeed forgotten, with the exception of a few idiomatic expressions, and terms of household import; nor are they possessed of any books in their native tongue. One individual, a Mrs. Long of Castletown Waller, in this county, who died at a very advanced age about twenty years since, and distinctly recollected the colonization of the Palatines in Ireland, directed that her Dutch Bible and books of devotion should be buried with her, because as the language was forgotten, the books might be treated with neglect and even contumely. Very few have risen above the pursuits of agriculture, to embrace any of the learned professions. They are almost exclusively attached to the Methodist connection; and their serious habits, education, industry, patriarchal simplicity of manners, scrupulous cleanliness, honest independence, and superior mode of agriculture, have all exercised an influence salutary, though slow, on the minds and occupations of those in the immediate neighbourhood of their settlements. The comparative longevity of the Palatines is remarkable, which I attribute chiefly to their abstemiousness in spirituous liquors, and the constant use of wholesome food. The first trace which I can discover of their voluntary exile is in the reign of Queen Anne, when an act for the general naturalization of foreign Protestants passed the parliament, after violent opposition from the Tories in both houses. The Whigs adduced the example of the king of Prussia, who having invited the French refugees to settle in his dominions, they had fertilized his country, and improved its trade and manufactures: and consequently that this measure would have a similar effect, and repair the want of men occasioned by the wars. "But one of their chief motives, (says Hume,) was to throw an addition of foreigners into the balance against the landed interest." The

Tories, on the other hand, pleaded that a conflux of aliens might prove dangerous to the constitution; that they would retain a hankering regard for their native country, and in war act as spies and enemies; that they would insinuate themselves into places of trust and profit, become members of parliament, and by frequent intermarriages, contribute to the extinction of the English name; that they would add to the number of poor, already too great, and share the bread of the labourers and tradesmen. The bill was however passed, although with several restrictions, in the May of that year. How utterly ridiculous at this distance of time appears the party bitterness of the politicians of that day! How improbable that places of trust or profit would be occupied, or the English name extinguished by a few thousand alien paupers. When the nineteenth century has lapsed into the waste, perhaps similar reflections will be passed on the time-serving policy and specious prejudices of these times. Immediately after the bill was passed, seven thousand poor Palatines and Snabians near the Rhine, who had been driven from their dwellings and ruined by the French, were brought over, and were soon after followed by others: but as plans had not been preconceived for their support and employment, there was considerable embarrassment about their location. Some proposed to send them to the American colonies, others to settle them in the new forest of Hampshire, on lands parcelled out in small lots. However, to preserve them from immediate want, tents were erected on Blackheath, near Camberwell; and a brief, to be collected from house to house through Great Britain, was granted to relieve their immediate necessities. Some were taken into private families: five hundred were sent into Ireland, and two thousand four hundred pounds were granted by parliament for their support: three thousand were sent to New York and settled on the Hudson's river; but being dissatisfied with their situation, they removed to Pennsylvania, where they were most kindly received by the Quakers, who were the first European settlers in that country, and who, by the consistent humanity and justice of their dealings with the native Indians, richly merited the rapidly encreasing population and resources which they enjoyed. We hear of these Palatines again in the year 1711, at the time of the ill-planned and unfortunate expedition against Quebec and Placentia, when the English were joined by a number of Palatines at Boston in New England.

In 1710, numbers of them were still in London without any fixed mode of subsistence: for in that year the inhabitants of St. Olaves, and other parishes, presented a petition to parliament, complaining that it was usual for many Palatines to inhabit one house; and that they might create a contagious distemper, and become a charge to the public, as they were destitute of fixed livelihood. This petition was got up by the Tory ministry, that they might have a handle for attacking the fallen Whigs. Ac-

ordingly a committee was appointed, to inquire upon what invitation the Palatines had come to England, and a resolution passed the Commons of severe censure against the promoters of that measure, as being fraught with dangerous consequence to the constitution in Church and State, and inimical to the stability of the crown and kingdom. They then passed a bill to repeal the Act for a general naturalization of foreign Protestants, which, however, was rejected in the Lords.

Here the thread of my research is broken; nor have I traced the history of this interesting people further. In America, as must necessarily happen in the progress of colonization, doubtless all national peculiarities gradually disappeared amid the reconstruction of society, when common wants were created and novel habits adopted. Still, if evidence of their derivation remained, cherished by tradition, or manifest in name, language, and facial outline, I have often thought how gladly might the Irish Palatine emigrant of the present day accost his transatlantic brother; with what familiar and friendly converse would they call to mind past providences, the voluntary exile of their ancestors from their father-land, the scattering of them through many countries, the critical situation of the remnant in Ireland, and their inclination to emigrate a second time, from causes not very dissimilar to those which induced their original expatriation. On these and such like subjects might they commune with affectionate earnestness; then look abroad on the wide green savannah, and bless God in silence for the enjoyment of freedom and the riches of the field.

Many once flourishing hamlets in the south-west of Ireland have dwindled to a few families, or totally disappeared, solely in consequence of the drain of emigration. Indeed I know very few instances of apostasy amongst them, and these happened chiefly among females intermarried with Roman Catholic families, which at all times they have scrupulously discountenanced. Their unflinching adherence to the Protestant faith has been cherished rather by the Methodist Mission than by the instrumentality of the Established clergy, during the latter part of the eighteenth and commencement of this century.

The causes of their emigration, in common with other Protestants, may be briefly enumerated. Exorbitant rents—for the Protestant, generally speaking, will require decent comforts and education for his family, and therefore cannot bid as high as his Roman Catholic neighbour, who will be satisfied with dry potatoes all the year. Many of the Palatine hamlets have become so populous, and their land so subdivided, that the youth are obliged to separate; and not being able to procure land in this country, they emigrate, and frequently induce parents and friends to accompany them. Another incitement to emigration is a dread of Roman Catholic ascendancy, which they anticipate will be ere long established, in consequence of the weakness and vacillation of government, manifested in late measures, especially in per-

mitting the refugee monks, regulars, jesuits, and trappists, to settle and have endowments and property in this country, contrary to the prohibitory edict of Parliament. The fear of religious bigotry, the prevalence of discontent, misgovernment, and the undue pressure of rents, have; these hundred years, been the real incitements to Protestant emigration. Tithes have been proclaimed to be the chief exciting cause; but with as little show of reason as when the Irish Parliament abolished tithe of agistment, in order to check the emigration of Protestants, which, in reality, was occasioned by the pressure of an exorbitant rental.

Primate Boulter states the number of Protestants who emigrated between the years 1725 and 1768, to be two hundred thousand, of whom many were Palatines. Notwithstanding this continued ebb, Burke, in his *Hibernia Dominicana*, written about 1750, declares that the Protestants of his day bore a proportion to the Roman Catholics of one to two. Since the passing of the Relief Bill, the number of Protestant emigrants has been estimated at considerably over one hundred thousand. If a wise and Christian policy had checked, in the last century, the tide of Protestant emigration, how would the country have progressed in morals, literature, manufactures, and agriculture. The retrospect is truly melancholy. Let us hope and pray for better things for Ireland. Farewell!

I am, with regard, yours,

JOHN LOCKE.

The Very Rev. Richard Murray, D.D.
Dean of Ardagh.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Crusaders; or Scenes, Events, and Characters, from the Times of the Crusades. By Thomas Keightley, Author of the "Mythology of Greece and Italy," &c. —London: Parker. 1833

It is difficult to conceive a more interesting subject than that presented to us by Mr. Keightley; it abounds with research for the antiquary, picturesque for the romantic, speculation for the philosopher, and events of undying interest for the historian; nor has poetry finer inventions, or fiction more striking situations, than what sober fact can furnish from these eventful periods. We are not surprised that they became the theme of Tasso's song, and have indeed deeply tinged all modern history with their own romantic dye; nor could we think for a moment of comparing "The Tale of Troy Divine," though gods and demigods contended there, in exciting interest and pathos, with the achievements of the Cross-bearers of European chivalry. One source of the superiority of the modern over the ancient *materiel* for poetry is assuredly to be derived from religion. The poet, or the historian of the Crusades, must make the intensely felt conviction of religion the primary motive that influenced every action and prompted every struggle; and however alloyed by ignorance and error, polluted by secular feelings of avarice and ambition, or brutalized by the admixture of cruelty and sensuality, still, degraded as it may seem to be, the religion of the Crusades is an infinitely grander and more pervading feeling than any that the mythology of Greece and Rome could permit. We confess, indeed, that much of the romantic interest thrown around the Crusades by the poetic imagination of a Tasso, is dissipated by the searching details of history, and few of the various heroes, with the exception of God-

frey, and perhaps of Tancred, can stand the inquiry; yet, even with these allowances, and they apply equally to Saracen and Christian, enough remains to excite our surprise that we have no connected history of the Crusades in our language, to which we can refer, as sufficiently full and sufficiently trustworthy. The inaccuracies of Mills, the prejudices of Gibbon, and the superficial statements of Robertson, all exclude them from the list; and we think Mr. Keightley has the field almost entirely to himself. To it he has brought an intimate acquaintance with the eminent continental authors who have examined the subject—an equally intimate knowledge of the annalists—a competent examination of the Asiatic authorities, and a free and partial spirit. He has, in consequence, produced a work that, we think, will be hereafter referred to as the best compendium of information, on the interesting topics on which it treats, in the language; and which, while it modestly disclaims the title of history, possesses its most important requisites. We shall present a few extracts to our readers, taken almost at random, and can assure them that they will find in the volume itself a fund of interesting and picturesque anecdote equally of persons and things.

"Truth compels us to acknowledge that he (Mohammed) possessed many great and noble qualities, and we might in charity believe, that born as he was in the midst of idolatry, with the whole world lying in darkness around him, the Light-Religion of Persia (by far the purest system of unrevealed religion) sunk and degraded, the Mosaic law become a burdensome and puerile superstition, and even Christianity itself nearly lost beneath the weight of false philosophy and abject idolatry

—he may have been sincere in the first enunciation of the sublime sentence on which his religious system rests, *There is no God but God.*

"But be this as it may, there is no doubt but that as soon as victory smiled on the banners of the Prophet in his first military encounters, his political horizon widened, and he aspired to triumphs of which at his outset he could not even have dreamed. Then was promulgated the maxim that the faith was to be spread by the sword: the enthusiasm of his followers was exalted by the assurance, that a night spent on guard was of more value in the sight of God, than sixty years passed in prayer: flight on the day of conflict rendered valueless all former good actions: the highest rewards of Paradise were reserved for the martyrs, *i. e.* those who fell in battles waged for the extension of the faith; and such a paradise as the artful Prophet presented to the glowing imagination of his Arabs!"

* * * * *

"To make his audience the more solemn and imposing, Alexius invited Godfrey, Boemond, and the other chiefs, to come over from Asia, and give their presence at it. But unmoved by their presence and their example, the Count of Toulouse steadily refused to take the oath of a vassal. When some of the crusaders expressed disapprobation of his obstinacy, he said, 'When entering on this expedition, I swore to God, and I cannot take the oath to any man. Nay, it is wrong to do homage even to two earthly lords, for there might easily arise a conflict of duties, and the Western suzerain might regard and punish as a breach of fealty the adoption of an Eastern lord.'

"These words of Count Raymond emboldened some of the knights who were present. One stepped forth and reproached the emperor, demanding of him va-

rious allowances; ere he could make a reply, a second, a third, a fourth, advanced with equal noise, and equal disregard of propriety. Alexius at first bore all patiently; at length he got up, and went over to the princes who had already taken the oath of homage to him. A knight, named Robert of Paris, instantly advanced to the throne, and placed himself in the emperor's seat. At this act of profanation in *their* eyes, the Greeks were filled with horror; the Latins too were highly indignant, and Baldwin going up, took him by the hand, and drew him away, saying it was want of manners anywhere knowingly to break through the customs of a country. But he made answer, 'Is then that clown to sit alone, while such noble princes are standing before him?' Alexius being informed of what he had said, inquired who and whence he was. The knight replied, 'I am nothing but a Frank of noble blood, and will only say this to the emperor, that in my country there stands at a cross-road an ancient chapel, in which every one who will venture on a single combat enters, to pray and to wait for an opponent. Oft have I there prayed, and long have I waited, but never yet found I one who would venture to engage me.' The emperor answered, 'You will now be more fortunate if you really seek an opportunity of displaying your courage. Whether you are in the van or the rear, the Turks will not keep you waiting; hardly will you find your former security even in the centre.'

* * * * *

"As long as the Saracens resisted, duke Godfrey fought valiantly against them, and chased them through the streets, slaying without pity the polluters of the holy places. He then clad himself in the pilgrim's frock, and hasted to the church of the Holy Sepulchre to humble himself before his Lord.

"The shades of evening were now falling, and the warriors, fatigued with slaughter, sheathed their swords, and thought of repose. Suddenly they recollected that they were now in the city which contained the holy places, the deliverance of which had been the object of their pilgrimage and their warfare. Then each pilgrim purified his person and his arms from the blood of the Infidels; he bared his head and feet, and in humble attitude moved through the streets, which still ran with blood, to the place where his Saviour had died for him, and had been laid in the tomb. The shout of triumph, the shriek of despair, no longer resounded through the streets; a solemn silence had succeeded, and now were to be heard only the hymn of praise and thanksgiving and the prayer of penitence, as with downcast looks the warriors sought the Mount of Calvary. Here the clergy of the place received them with loud expressions of gratitude for the deliverance their arms had achieved, and much did they extol the Hermit, who had thus fulfilled the promise made five years before. The pilgrims could not satiate themselves with viewing the holy places; they confessed their sins, and promised amendment of life."

* * *

"Zenghi lived on terms of great familiarity with his officers and ministers. He generally made trial of them himself, by which means it rarely happened that he was mistaken in the characters of the persons whom he selected for places of trust. For example, he had a servant, named Sailetoo, to whom he gave one day some sweetmeats, with directions to keep them for him. Sailetoo took them, and wrapping them up in a napkin, placed them in his bosom. He always carried them about him, that he might have them ready whenever Zenghi should call for them. He thus carried them an

entire year. One day Zenghi suddenly said to him, 'Where are my sweetmeats?'—'Here they are,' replied he, drawing them out of his bosom. Zenghi was greatly pleased. 'There is a man,' said he, 'fit to govern a town.' He shortly after gave him the government of a castle, which post he held till the death of the prince.

"Zenghi was very charitable; every Friday he distributed a hundred pieces of gold in alms among the poor, besides what he gave on the ordinary week-days, through the hands of a confidential person. Our author tells us that, as he was riding out one day, his horse stumbled with him, and he had like to fall. He immediately called to him one of his emirs, named Beliman, and said some words to him, which the emir did not hear, and which he did not dare to make him repeat. He instantly became alarmed, went straight home, and began to take his leave of his wife and children, fully resolved to go and seek refuge in some foreign country. His wife, in amazement, asked what he had done, what crime he had committed. Beliman told her the whole affair. '*Nassir-ed-deen (Victory of Religion)* has a friendship for thee; go to him, and do as he will direct thee.'—'I fear,' said Beliman, 'he will be against my taking to flight, and in that case I am a lost man.' His wife, however, persisted, and at last prevailed on him to go. When Nassir-ed-deen had heard the story, he began to laugh, and said to Beliman, 'Here, take this purse of gold, and go with it to the prince. That is what he bade thee to do.'—'Allah, Allah!' cried Beliman; 'I recover my spirits; I come again to life.'—'Go, be not afraid,' said Nassir-ed-deen; 'he wanted nothing else of thee.' Beliman carried the money to Zenghi, who bade him distribute it among the poor. When he had done so, he went back to Nassir-ed-deen, and said to him, 'But

how didst thou know that he wanted this purse?—'Tis his custom on such a day as this to distribute that sum among the poor. He usually sends to me for it the evening before, but this time he had forgotten it. I heard that his horse had stumbled, and had like to have thrown him, and also knew that he had told thee to come to me, and I judged that he had recollected the alms. It was

for this reason that I told thee to take the purse to him.'

"One day while Zenghi was at Jezireh, he went with a small retinue to take an airing on the river. He found the boatman asleep. One waked him, saying, 'Come! to thy post!' The boatman looked, and beheld Zenghi, and instantly dropped dead. All efforts to restore him to animation were unavailing."

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

(From the *Galway Advertiser*.)

Copy of a letter from the Rev. John M. Wilson, to the Right Rev. Dr. Brown, Roman Catholic Bishop of Galway.

Galway, 11th Oct. 1838.

My Lord Bishop,

Immediately after a Bible Meeting, held here on the 12th of June last, a newspaper of this town, called the ——— repeatedly made such wanton and violent attacks on the friends of the Bible Society, that we were obliged, in self-defence, and for the vindication of our cause, to seek out an organ for the public expression of our sentiments. After having in vain, during a period of three months, laboured by every other means to destroy our influence and reduce us to silence, the ——— has recently commenced an outrageous effort to arouse the worst passions of the populace, and to direct these against our persons. Twice has it held up the Rev. M. H. Seymour as a mark for popular indignation, denouncing him as a man whose "bones should be made to ache," and his shoulders lacerated "with the horse-whip;" and in several successive publications, it has especially invoked the vengeance of the public upon me, proclaiming me a person who should

be "trodden under foot," and calling on Protestants and Roman Catholics to unite in not "suffering me (whether to 'live or dwell' it says not) within the walls of the town." The intention of the Journal is, according to its own language, to "put me down;" and as it has failed to do this by "moral" means, it now appears to attempt it by seeking my "personal destruction." The rage and fury of its language are almost without a parallel. Never did newspaper adopt a course more exasperating to the popular mind, or more powerfully calculated to rouse the mob to acts of personal violence; and though the whole and the only tendency of its denunciations can be none other than the "shedding of blood," it publicly avows a determination to persevere in repeating them till its objects be accomplished.

Yet this Journal is distinguished by nothing so much as an entire and zealous devotion to the interests of your Church; and it wears all the appearance of being, what common fame had generally represented it, the organ of Romanism in your diocese. Individuals among your priests are reported to be in frequent consultation with the Editor, and are

believed by many to lend their sanction and concurrence to its management. All its leading sentiments are popularly regarded as your own. Whatever, in particular, it advances against those whom it has aptly and most honorably termed "Biblicals," is received almost in the same light as if written by yourself or one of your Clergy; most persons being convinced either that some one or more of your priests expressly give their imprimatur to its articles, or at least that you and they have perfect power to suppress, restrain, or modify them as you please.

If then, the public and I believe the persecuting and inflammatory conduct of the ——— to be sanctioned by yourself, and carried on by the secret agency of your Clergy, what reason can be stated; can the shadow of either fact or argument be advanced, to make us think ourselves mistaken? My Lord! I demand justice at your hands—justice to your Clergy and yourself. If the horrid sentiments of the ——— have not your approbation, *disclaim them*. If that journal be not the organ of your priests, disclaim it, and disabuse the public mind of its erroneous impression. If it has not been written with the concurrence of any individuals under your control, disclaim it; *publicly* disclaim it: and declare both for yourself and for your clergy that its personal denunciations have met that indignation from you which they deserve.—Nothing short of this can neutralize the popular belief as to the ——— being the organ of your priests,—a belief which if permitted to exist, must hold you solemnly responsible both to God and us for whatever consequences may fall on either Mr. Seymour or myself. Let the declaration of both your Clergy's disapprobation and your own be as public, as widely spread, as strong, and as explicit, as were those articles, written and publish-

ed under the reported sanction of your Church, in which our persons were denounced;—this we claim as an act of common justice; we demand it as our right.

I believe that, as a gentleman, you will *answer this letter*; and I can fervently and sincerely say, that if your answer be such as, with a permission given me (if necessary) to publish it, will entirely free each of your Clergy from all participation in the violent and unworthy proceedings of the ———, and all approbation of its outrageous sentiments, I shall feel unmingled satisfaction and pleasure. But should you either refuse me the act of justice I have claimed, or, after a reasonable time for reply, take no notice of my letter, I shall then feel myself bound to *construe your silence as an answer*, and to regard that silence both as a full acknowledgment that the ——— has spoken as your organ, and as a fresh and confirmed approval of the violent and persecuting doctrines he has promulgated; and as I have made extracts of all that journal's obnoxious passages, and sent them to some friends of mine who are connected with the London Press, I shall likewise cause these, along with a copy of this letter to yourself, to be so published, that they may go the round of the British newspapers, as living exemplifications of the spirit of Romanism in the diocese of Galway, and as practical illustrations of what my Protestant fellow-subjects have to expect, should your Church ever acquire that power in the empire to which so many of her sons aspire. This would be only a *trifling* but yet a *moral* means of defence against measures so publicly and directly endangering personal safety. Most persons denounced as I have been, would have sought modes of protection more apparently effective; but I am anxious, if possible, to confine myself to means merely and altogether *moral*,

and when there is a choice, to adopt the mildest available one of even these. I give proof of this, in making my first resource consist simply in an appeal to yourself; and I shall think it but a poor return for the openness and straightforwardness of my conduct, if I do not receive such an answer from you as will be satisfactory to myself, and enable me to think with respect of you.

But should either your silence or your inefficient procedure demonstrate the sentiments of the ——— to be those likewise of your Clergy, I must now tell you, for both my brother Biblicals and myself, that if any consideration under Heaven, in addition to the love of truth, the love of souls, and the love of Christ, could nerve us with undying devotedness and render us firm, unwavering, and "faithful to the death" in the glorious work of disseminating the word of God, and opposing the errors of its enemies, it is the denunciation of our persons, and the endangering of our earthly safety by men pretending to be ministers of religion. *We are not to be intimidated*; "the fear of man" is denounced in our Bible as a crime. When honoured with even the *extremes* of persecution; when either degraded in our name, or imperilled in our persons, our religion allows us only to "rejoice and be exceeding glad." To suffer for Christ, for his truth, or for his Holy Word, we feel it to be both a seal of approbation set on our faithfulness by Heaven, and an arousing stimulant to additional heroism, to increased energy, and to multiplied exertion. He, for the love of whom we act and suffer; he in whom rests our entire and devoted confidence; he whose will alone we seek to follow, whose authority alone we recognise, and for whose glory alone we labour, "is the Lord, that only Lord God who bought us," that God "besides whom there is no Saviour," "who

alone giveth immortality," in whom alone is salvation, who alone "hath the keys of death and the invisible world," who is "all and in all," "exalted far above all Heavens, that he might fill all things," and be head over all things for his people's sake who believe in him; and should we even suffer death itself for his sake, we do not doubt, and dare not question, either his willingness or his power to give us the everlasting glory he has pledged to all who are "slain for the Word of God and for his testimony." Terrorism can affect Biblicals only in the way it affected St. Paul, for they serve the same Lord, and place their dependance only in the same grace; and if not to the extent, at least in the spirit of that great apostle they can say, "the Lord hath said unto us, My grace is sufficient for you, for my strength is made perfect in weakness; most gladly therefore will we rather glory in our infirmities (and dangers,) that the power of Christ may rest upon us; therefore, we take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessity, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake, for when we are weak, then we are strong."

You will not, I earnestly hope, misunderstand the spirit of my letter; it is a spirit of firmness, indeed, but I have designed it to be not less a spirit of respect, and even of Christian affection. Whatever may be my deathless opposition to your doctrines, I have no feeling towards the persons of your clergy but one of kindly, anxious, and earnest prayer for their salvation. There is not a hope, a consolation, a blessing, or a good which I possess, but what I would most earnestly desire to see possessed in a still greater degree by yourself, and by each one of your priests and people. The day will soon come when "each man must give an account of himself to God," and it would send a thrill of ecstasy through my heart, if, in the

prospect of that great day I saw each man, like Paul the apostle, "determining to know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified," and trusting wholly, truly, holily, and exclusively in the one Mediator and one refuge of sinners, "who hath the keys of David, who openeth and no man shutteth, and who shutteth and no man openeth."

I am, my Lord Bishop,

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN MARIUS WILSON.

To the Rt. Rev. Dr. Browne,

R. C. Bishop of Galway.

P. S.—Though I have addressed you by the titles given you in your church, I beg you to understand that I use them, not as they describe your religious office, but merely as your designation in civil society. In their religious application I protest at once against the titles themselves, the purposes they are designed to serve, and the authority whence they are derived; and I have used them only to prevent an appearance of disrespect, and lest you should have thought me wanting in courtesy. This explanation is due to my own conscience.

I wish to take no unfair advantage, and am anxious to view your church as favourably as facts will admit; and though twenty-four or forty-eight hours would be ample time for a reply, I shall patiently wait for your answer during six days.

J. M. WILSON.

The following are a few of the personal denunciations to which Mr. Wilson's letter refers; but we select them only as specimens from among many more of the same sort:—

"Is it to be tolerated that such reptiles as John Marius Wilson, *et hoc genus omne*, a hell-inspired junta of incarnate fiends, whom nothing but the wrath of Heaven could have sent upon the earth to

spread horror and devastation amongst the human race, should be allowed to crawl upon the earth without being at once trampled upon, that the malignant poison of their nature," &c. "Instead of resorting to the war of words, we would prefer applying to his (the Rev. M. H. Seymour's) shoulders; for he merits to be replied to by no other argument but one that might cause his bones to ache, and thereby bring his flesh in subjection to the spirit, no easy thing to accomplish," &c. "The Biblical junta must be put down in Galway." "It is the interest of the people of Galway to put down such persons, for if the devil himself came upon earth, he would resume no other garb but that of one of these Biblicals." "We hold that the new junta of fanatics that have lately crept into Galway are dangerous to its peace, so long as they are permitted to pursue their present exasperating system; their opinions are ruinous to the peace and happiness of society.—And it would be a very false notion of liberality indeed, if we did not conceive that it was an act of virtue to check their dissemination by holding up their authors and abettors as marked objects for public contempt and indignation." "While such men as John Marius Wilson are allowed to strut the streets with the Bible under his arm, it is not to be wondered at," &c. "We therefore repeat that such men should not and must not be tolerated within the walls of Galway, and we assert that it is the duty of Protestants and Catholics, for the sake of mutual good will, to unite in accomplishing this desirable object." "One serpent has hence been banished to Ballinrobe, but there still remains a greater reptile, John Marius Wilson, who must at once be trodden under foot; we are determined to persevere until we TERMINATE HIS ODIOS CAREER."

THE CHURCH.

His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin has been pleased to license the Rev. Robert Handcock, son of the Rev. Dr. Handcock, to the curacy of St. Thomas's parish.

His excellency the Lord Lieutenant has been pleased to appoint the Rev. Gorges M. D'Arcy Irvine (Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Charleville) to be one of his Excellency's Chaplains.

The Rev. Arthur Herbert has definitely accepted the living of Killarney, in the gift of Lord Kenmare, vacant since the Rev. Mr. Hyde's death. The former clergyman had for some time declined the offer.

The Rev. Thomas Bland, previous to closing his ministry in the parish of Killarney, delivered, on Sunday last, a farewell address to the entire flock, whose faithful and beloved pastor he had been for nine years. Mr. Bland is succeeded, at Killarney, as curate, by the Rev. Mr. Harding.

The Prebend of Athnett, the parishes of Kilquane, Ardpatrick, Killmaley, and the non-cures annexed to the Bishopric of Limerick, are to be disunited from it, and the revenues arising therefrom placed at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

The Rev. Mr. Falkener, many years the worthy Curate of Templemore, has got a portion of that Union enjoyed by the late Rev. Harry Meggs Graves.

The Rev. Mr. Swayne is promoted to the Church living, near Cashel, held by the Rev. Mr. Begenal.

His Grace the Archbishop of Cashel will certainly fix his residence at Waterford, and it is very singular that in the whole Archdiocese there will not then be one resident dignitary of the Church. The Dean of Cashel, Dr. Adams, resides at Northlands, near Cavan.

The parishioners of Cove have voted an address and a piece of

plate to the Rev. P. W. Dréw, on his removal to the curacy of Youghal.

DUNDALK CHURCH.—On Sunday, the 8th December, the Church of Dundalk, which has recently undergone various improvements, had an accession to its simple grandeur by the erection of a well-toned organ, towards the purchase of which we understand his Grace the Lord Primate, with his accustomed beneficence, presented, unsolicited, the Rev. Mr. Thackeray with the princely donation of 50*l.*, saying that he considered this was due to Mrs. Thackeray for her unwearied exertions, during so many years, in forming and improving the choir of Dundalk.

The Lord Bishop of Derry, brother to the Countess Grey, will be one of the Irish Representative Bishops in the approaching session of Parliament. His lordship's right reverend colleagues, in the order of rotation, will be the Archbishop of Cashel (Right Hon. R. Laurence), the Bishop of Meath (Right Hon. N. Alexander), and the Bishop of Kildare (Right Hon. C. D. Lindsay.)

On Sunday week a collection was made in the parish church, Elgin, in aid of the Association for the purpose of sending clergymen, in connexion with the Established Church of Scotland, to our dominions in the East Indies, when 12*l.* 7*s.* 7*d.* was collected.

CHURCH MILLION ACT.

The following is a list of the number of claimants for relief from the different counties under this act:—Antrim 4; Fermanagh 7; Letchim 7; Londonderry 11; Tyrone 13; Monaghan 19; Armagh 20; Cavan 26; Longford 26; Wicklow 28; Down 29; Sligo 37; Dublin 46; Donegal 51; King's County 52; Carlow 60; Roscommon 61; Queen's County 62; Loath 62; Kerry 64; Westmeath 66; Meath 77; Mayo 83; Galway 111; Kildare 111; Waterford 115; Clare 126; Kilkenny

157; Limerick 158; Wexford 215; Tipperary 275; Cork 307. Total 2,486.

At a Privy Council at Dublin Castle, on Thursday last week, an advance of money, under the 3d and 4th William IV., an Act for Relief of Owners of Tithes in Ireland, was awarded to the following clergymen in the diocese of Armagh, viz. :—Rev. J. S. Campbell, Rev. W. Maleuwerer, Rev. J. Brownlow, Rev. C. Atkinson, Rev. R. Woods, Rev. J. Crawford, Rev. S. Jerrard, Rev. J. Kerr, of Termonfecken, Rev. J. Kerr, of Clogher, Rev. J. Kerr, of Mayne, Rev. A. Lindsay, of Rathdrum, Rev. A. Lindsay, of Port, and Rev. A. Lindsay, of Carrickboget.

NEW CHURCH IN CORK.

It gives us sincere pleasure, in times like the present, when the Papist, Infidel, and Radical, are unceasing in their efforts to destroy the Church Establishment, to perceive that our southern friends, who duly appreciate the blessings that flow from Christianity, are roused to exertion in the sacred cause of godliness, and are zealous for the communication of these blessings to their fellow-citizens. Cork is acting a conspicuous part; its excellent Diocesan, on a review of the state of his Episcopal charge, beheld, with regret, the want of accommodation in the churches of that city, for the Protestant portion of the community, especially those of the poorer order, and, with commendable ardour, subscribed the sum of 100*l.* towards the erection of a chapel of ease in the most populous part of the city. This praiseworthy example was quickly followed, and subscriptions to a considerable amount have been already received. An Episcopal Free Church is also about to be erected, the funds for which are deposited in the hands of trustees, the majority of whom are clergymen of the Established Church. The moral and religious inhabitants of

Cork have contributed largely for both of these buildings; but, from an insufficiency of means, they are still obliged to appeal to all who "love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth," to aid them in the good work. The people are "perishing for the lack of knowledge." Not more than one-fourth of the Protestant population can hear the joyful sound of the Gospel on each returning Sabbath! No wonder, then, that Irreligion, and its handmaid Disaffection, are seen in our streets—that drunkenness, with its disgusting scenes, is so familiar to our eyes. The publishers of the *EXAMINER* will be most happy to receive contributions for either or both of these hallowed undertakings, from the friends of *God*, from the friends of the *Bible*, in any part of the country.

RESISTANCE TO PRIESTS' DUES.

—On Christmas Day a novel exhibition of party feeling occurred in the Chapel of Lisdowney. After the celebration of Mass, the Rev. Mr. Tobin, the R. C. Curate, proceeded to call the names of several parishioners who had neglected to pay the customary dues, whereupon one of them, backed by others, came forward and offered some strong observations on the impropriety of such a proceeding. The Rev. Curate was astonished at this unexpected opposition. However, in a short time, a party, superior in numbers, made their appearance, determined to back the Priest, when a contest arose *in the body of the chapel*, in the course of which Mr. Tobin is said to have fainted at the altar. His friends, however, were victorious, and the opposing party were driven from the chapel.—*Kilkenny Moderator*.

TWENTY-THIRD REPORT OF THE SUNDAY SCHOOL SOCIETY FOR IRELAND.—The progress of Sunday schools is slow, but we rejoice to observe that there is on the whole an increase in the past year. In the province of Ulster, out of

a population of 2,294,128, there are 156,712 at Sunday schools; that is 1 to 15 of the population. The increase during the past year has been 25 schools, 3,539 scholars, and 478 teachers.

In the province of Leinster, out of a population of 1,927,967, there are 28,630 scholars, 1 to 67 of the population, and the decrease in the whole province is 4 schools, 5 scholars, and 7 teachers.

In the province of Connaught, out of a population of 1,348,077, there are 7,162 Sunday scholars, 1 to 188 of the population, being an increase since last year of 4 schools, 539 scholars, and 27 teachers.

In the province of Munster, out of a population of 2,165,193, there are 14,213 Sunday scholars, 1 to 152 of the population, being an increase during the past year of 6 schools and 191 scholars. Thus these four provinces of Ireland, containing 7,734,365 souls, has 206,717 Sunday scholars, being 1 to 37 of the population, and the total increase of Sunday schools and scholars, from 1st January, 1832, to 1st January, 1833, is 31 schools and 4,564 scholars.

SABBATH SCENES.—A Roman Catholic chapel in the eastern part of this county, was on two Sabbaths in the present month the theatre of a rather extraordinary exhibition. Between the families of two of the most respectable of the parishioners by whom it is frequented (Mr. R. and Mr. M.) a misunderstanding had for some existed with respect to a pew, to which both claimed the right of possession. As neither gentleman is celebrated for the placability of his disposition, neither was disposed to waive his claim, and each regarded the appearance of the other in the pew as an unwarrantable intrusion on his property. This was not wonderful, for as both these gentlemen are *patriots*, and have long been engaged in protecting what they call the rights

of *the people*, it could not be expected that they would quietly submit to an infringement on *their own*. On Sunday fortnight, Mr. R.'s children were despatched to the parish chapel; but on attempting to enter the pew in which they had been accustomed to take their seats, they found themselves opposed by Mr. M., who had locked the door, and most uncouthly accosted them with "you shan't enter here—go home and eat stirabout!" To the stirabout part of the business the poor children appeared to have no objection, but their blood was aroused by the allusion, and it was paid back with interest by the elder boy, who indignantly replied, that provided the stirabout could be procured "without shutting up shop and robbing the public," they would be quite satisfied to eat it. This retort was anything but relished by Mr. M., and he returned it in such measure as the terms in which he opened would lead one to expect. The children, however, were not to be bullied—the contention waxed warm—the tone in which it was waged rose higher, until at length general attention was attracted—the congregation interfered, and the youngsters were removed from the pew-door and conducted to another. Thus terminated matters for the present, but thus they did not long continue. Tidings of what had occurred were conveyed to the ears of Mr. R., who resolved to be first in the field on the next Sabbath, and to assert in person his right to the disputed pew. Accordingly, when the day arrived, Mr. R. was early on the alert, and entered the chapel with the air of a man who was determined to have every thing his own way. Mr. M., however, knowing that "possession is nine points of the law," was there before him, and to render "surety doubly sure," had locked the pew, and when Mr. R. presented himself, he and the family were snugly seated in it,

without the remotest apprehension of disturbance. Mr. R. seeing how matters stood, applied his strength to the door, and in it went before him. A feat of this kind had not been calculated on by Mr. M., who, as soon as he recovered from his surprise, coolly seized the intruder by the collar, and endeavoured to eject him. This, however, was no easy matter. Having been at such trouble to get in, Mr. R. had no inclination so easily to go out, and the consequence was an appeal to the usual arbiter of Irish disputation. Blows were given and returned in good earnest, and blood must soon have flowed but for the interposition of some gentlemen, who, at considerable hazard, succeeded in parting the combatants. The scene which the chapel presented while these proceedings were enacting, it would not be easy to describe. The ladies screamed with terror, and the rougher members of the congregation were stricken with dismay. When the fray was over, the priest called on Mr. R. to quit the pew and apologize; but Mr. R. was inexorable, and he called in vain. The seat which he had won at the expense of so much prowess, he was determined to retain, and he did retain it, though during the remainder of the service three gentlemen were obliged to stand between him and Mr. M., to prevent a renewal of the engagement. Law proceedings, we understand, are likely to arise out of these amusements.—*Cork Constitution.*

THE GRAND JURIES AND CHARITIES OF CORK.—A most inquisitorial investigation into the corporate affairs of Cork, managed, as well as we can collect from the reports which we have seen, with great unfairness and impertinence, has been going on in that city. The papists there, as every where else, seem to take it for granted that the tolerance of a Protestant corporation, or even of a Protes-

tant in any office whatever, is a calamity no longer to be endured. It was complained of, among other matters, that Roman Catholics were not more profusely placed on grand juries. The answer was ready—Cork does not contain persons of that creed of sufficient respectability to supply more than were generally selected. Although that city, greatly to the credit of its intellect, returns to parliament two gentlemen who figure in a procession after a holy water-pot through the streets (and this in the nineteenth century! and in Ireland, which has made such giant strides towards civilization!) the property there, as every where else throughout Ireland, is almost exclusively Protestant. A curious return offered to the commissioners, but by them rejected, was given in proof of this—it is the return of the sums subscribed to the public charities of the city. We take it from the *Cork Constitution*:—The total amount of the subscriptions to the 11 charities for the last year was £3,190; of this sum there was subscribed by Protestants £2,782; by Roman Catholics £408. The number relieved by the above charities was 55,986. Of this number there were Protestants, 2,380; Roman Catholics, 53,606.

So much for the charities. Now for the cholera fund—a fund to which, if ever human wretchedness appealed with effect to human sympathy, it were to be expected all would have contributed cheerfully and liberally. How stands the fact? The total of the donations amounted to £3,974; and of this sum there was subscribed, by Protestants, £3,304; by Roman Catholics, £670!!!

Independently of the above return, the Protestants of Cork support fifteen daily and twelve Sunday schools, besides upwards of twenty other benevolent establishments; but these being for the use and benefit of Protestants only,

they have not been introduced into the return made to the commissioners.

Of subscriptions amounting to £7,000, £1,008 was contributed by Roman Catholics, but they would have no objection to reverse the proportion in grasping all offices of honour or emolument. Another use, however, may be made of this table. The population of Cork is 105,000. Of this number *fifty-six* thousand—some-what more than half—were relieved by the charities of the city last year. Such is the state of the people to whom emancipation was to have been a benefit!—*From the Standard.*

MORE CONVERSIONS TO CATHOLICITY.—We have just seen a letter from an individual of high literary reputation in England to a gentleman in this town, communicating the intelligence of another Protestant clergyman, the Rev. Dr. King, of London, having lately followed the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Spencer's noble example, by embracing the doctrines of the Catholic Church. After two years incessant searching after the truth, he lately made his profession of faith before the Rt. Rev. Dr. Baines.—*Wexford Independent.*

THE REV. DR. M'LEOD OF CAMPSIE'S IRISH TOUR.—This Rev. Divine, after four weeks scrutiny into the moral state of Ireland, is again, we are glad to say, returned to his family and flock. Upon his return he found his parishioners so eager to learn the result of his tour that, for this purpose, he appointed last Sabbath afternoon, when the parish church was crowded to excess, and a public collection made on behalf of the native Irish. So deep is the interest felt on this subject, that a number of Glasgow gentlemen, we understand, went to Campsie to hear the account.

The Rev. Divine chose for his text, Phil. ii. 4, "Look not every

man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." Having expounded the spirit of the text, the eloquent Doctor went on to plead the cause of neglected Ireland:—

"Within view of these mountains where they were congregated, he said, was a country richer than their own, but a country morally poor indeed, inasmuch as it was in a great measure without power or opportunity either to hear or read the word of God; in a state worse than that in which a Knox and a Hamilton once found Scotland. Yes, Ireland was the seat of moral tyranny, laying in the dust the spirits of her generous inhabitants! The number of those speaking the Irish language, he found, was more than is generally supposed; there were from two to three *millions* who could not receive regular instruction *effectually* through any other medium. Of the county of Galway alone, the population exceeded that of all the Highlands of Scotland, and so little was the English tongue known there, that no salesman would be admitted into a shop without being acquainted with the Irish language. The Protestant clergy contemned the Irish, and did not understand it; the priests loved it and spoke it. We had fifteen thousand Protestant clergy, but not *one* to *unpreach* what these Irish priests so powerfully inculcate! If they wished to see the horrors of popery, they must not stop in this country: they must cross to Ireland, nor step on her near borders; they must proceed; as he did, to Connaught, to Conemara, and the western districts; there they were aroused on Sabbath morning, not by the solemn sound of the church bell, but by the clamour of men and women erecting their booths, and the afternoon of the holy day devoted to every kind of revelry, countenanced by priest and friar!

"The state of Ireland was indescribable. He had himself been in a shop where people, in broad day-light, came in to purchase a certain sort of thick cloth, to wrap round the body of a deceased friend, with a view to mollify the flames of purgatory till 'father' such a one had time to pray him out, which, from a press of business, they said, he could not do for eight or nine days! The common people believe, that *not to know* their Bible is their salvation, because in this case the responsibility falls upon the priests. There were a number of things put for Christ and his free salvation besides the priest. To deliver *some* from purgatory, one hundred masses were necessary, some of which cost the poor eighty pounds. There were in Galway alone *four thousand* who worshipped the Virgin as the *Lady of Mount Carmel*, and who were *allowed* to wear 'a charm' as a perpetual safeguard and saviour! There were also 'holy wells,' to one of which, namely, that in the island of Loch-dearg, *five thousand* had resorted in *one* day to perform vows and do penance. These poor creatures the Rev. Doctor himself saw going round these walls upon their knees, with the blood oozing out, and the flesh literally torn away to the bone. The ferry to this island was let at two hundred and sixty pounds per annum, all paid in *pence* by these votaries! There was another island, namely, the Eagle Island, thirteen miles by ten, and containing a population of four thousand souls, where there never was a school, never a chapel, never one means of grace enjoyed, the subject of one unbroken spiritual famine, where the only god worshipped is *the figure-head of a ship* which had been wrecked on its rugged shore! O Ireland! many a gallant ship has been wrecked upon thy coast; these attracted notice, but thou thyself art a moral wreck, yet no one pities! The

Gaelic, the Welsh, the Manks, the English, have all their stated preachers, and their stated places of worship; but the Irish, the language of millions, has not a single stated pastor, a single building devoted to the preaching of it! The eloquent divine, among a number of other things, mentioned that the Synod of Ulster had unanimously resolved to license none who intend to preach to the native Irish, unless found qualified to preach in that language. It had also been ascertained, that a person acquainted with the Gaelic of Scotland, by studying the Irish tone for two or three months, will be perfectly up to the language. The Rev. Doctor having finished his most feeling address, expressed a hope that collections for the native Irish should be made general in this country, for a more peaceable and affectionate people he had never met. The collection amounted to upwards of twenty pounds.

FROM A CORRESPONDENT.

THE ST. SIMONIAN MISSION IN LONDON.

The St. Simonians have sent a mission to this country, where they have the most sanguine hopes of success in propagating their peculiar opinions.—On Monday evening M. Fontana, a priest of the above politico-religious sect, appeared according to public notice at the Burton Rooms, Burton Crescent, to consecrate a Church wherein to promulgate the St. Simonian doctrines. The missionary is apparently about 26 years of age. He wears his hair short, a formidable pair of mustachios, and has his neck bare; his dress (the St. Simonian costume) is a very short military frock coat, encircled by a large leathern belt fastened by a shining buckle; it is open at the top, and through the opening appears a red double-breasted waistcoat, on which is worked in black letters the word "Fontana." He

went through the ceremony of consecrating the spot, and stated that he should appear there every fifteen days, for the purpose of expounding the doctrines of the sect. After which Mr. Detroisier (having first disclaimed belonging to the sect) read a series of letters addressed to the head of the St. Simonians at Paris, by the missionaries who were engaged in propagating their doctrines in different parts of the world; and detailing the sufferings, and persecutions, and adventures they had encountered in their progress. The letters stated the details of their progress at Constantinople, Lyons, and other places. The missionary at Constantinople informed his "Father" that one of his fellow-missionaries had transgressed, on which he had ordered him to be judged; that they had all, however, improved in moral health, but had suffered grievously from the bowel complaint.—(Here Mr. Detroisier seemed to be at a loss whether to laugh or cry.) At Nismes they were hooted and pelted by the populace, but were feasted by the corporation of shoemakers. At Tarascone they were more ferociously received than at Nismes, but their wonted calmness never forsook them; they were saved from the rage of the populace by the interference of the young men of the town, who, hurrying from their houses and coffee-rooms, with canes, swords and fusils in their hands, dispersed the mob. At Montereau they stopped on the mountain upon which Napoleon pointed his last cannon against the invaders of France; and to illustrate the difference between their system of government and the warlike system of Napoleon, they on that spot seated themselves on the mountain, and in the presence of many spectators, in the midst of singing and good cheer, began and finished making "a pair of trowsers for a brother,"—(loud laughter.) At Fontanbleau they were arrested

by order of the King's attorney, and conveyed to Paris. M. Fontana then said, that his situation of Chief of the St. Simonian Church in London, gave him the power of naming as brothers and sisters of the new fraternity, any of those around them who sympathized with St. Simonian ideas, to whom he was ready to explain both his public and private conduct (hear.) M. Prato, L.L.D. delivered an oration in favour of St. Simonianism, after which a female Southcottian addressed the meeting in praise of Johanna Southcote and her writings. Another meeting was announced for that night fortnight. A collection was made at the doors, and the meeting separated.

The rooms were tolerably full, nor was a sprinkling of the gentler sex wanting, and the audience was chiefly composed of the followers of Mr. Owen, and those whom curiosity had collected together.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, SAXONY.

A considerable number of the more active and enlightened among the German Catholics have of late years been seeking an opportunity of shaking off the thralldom, in which both the principles and practices of their faith have for so long a period been held by the Roman Pontiffs: and Saxony has now begun to bestir herself at the example of Silesia, Baden, and Wurtemberg. To show the extent to which the views of Church Reform, entertained by the Roman Catholic population of Saxony, are carried, we cannot take a better course than that of laying before the reader the translation of a document which emanates from a body of between nine hundred and a thousand Catholics, resident in the Saxon capital. It is entitled, "Some brief suggestions on the subject of the Catholic Church in Saxony." The title would scarcely seem to imply so salutary and comprehensive a reform as the

body of the suggestions themselves lays down. "There can be no doubt," observe the remonstrants, "that the independence of Rome is the primary condition of emancipation in our Church, for the one cannot be accomplished without the obtention of the other; but this is not the limit of its reform. Other rocks, which are a hindrance to social and brotherly union, must be jelled down to friendly eminences, if we would be taken as forming a constituent part of the community, with all its ties and affections. Let it be allowed us, therefore, thus publicly to make our proposals known. We ask, 1. Perfect equality as members of the State; 2. Dispensation from auricular confession, which may so readily be converted into a means of accomplishing other purposes, and has but too often the effect of enhancing the guilt of the offender; 3. Permission to re-marry for individuals whom the principles of the Catholic Church have divorced for life; for numerous instances might be adduced of the lamentable effects which have resulted from the arbitrary practice of the Church in this particular—effects engendering not only looseness of conduct and other vices, destructive of moral order, but inducing conversion to other forms of faith; 4. Suppression of celibacy. The operation of this law, which wars against all human nature, might readily be productive of still greater depravity than what is implied in the preceding article. It would appear but reasonable, therefore, if marriage in the case of the Catholic ecclesiastic be an inevitable evil, that of two evils, the least should be chosen; 5. Curtailing of the daily performance of Divine service. The repetition of the sacrifice of the Holy Mass, six, seven, and even more times every day in the week, is an excess inflicted on our congregations. Diminution in this respect, combined with a dispensation from auricular con-

fession, would pave the way for a diminution in the numbers of the priesthood, as well as in the expense attendant upon the celebration of Catholic worship; 6. Suppression of superfluous holidays, and, if practicable, the reducing them to the same number as Protestant festivals, even with reference to the anniversary of the Reformation, seeing how sore a need our own Church has of it; and 7. A reduction in the number of that enormously expensive body, the Church singers. A simple hymn, proceeding from the lips of the congregation, is better calculated to elevate the heart than the pompous vocalism of a highly-salaried foreigner, who can only extort applause from the refined ears of such as come to the Church to look on, but not to pray. The real suppliant is compelled to part either with his devotion, or his love of science, and the country itself with large sums of money. Let our Church be blessed with such a reform as this, and her adherents will abound, peace and well-being will be universally diffused, and all will cheerfully submit to the supremacy of a national priesthood. What man shall deem us in fault, if, driven by the obstinate rejection of such rational proposals as these, we should be forced across the threshold of the Protestant Church?"—Signed, "An Association of Catholics." We will venture but one observation on this remarkable paper. A Catholic Church, which should undergo such purification as is here contended for, might not cease to be Catholic, but it would no longer partake of the Catholicism of the Church of Rome. It would be Christianity shorn of the degrading autocracy of the Quirinal, its coils and heresies; it would be such a reformation in faith as involves no abandonment of abstract religious principle; and, whenever it should diffuse its spirit to the Sister Kingdom, would re-

store to that suffering and deluded country the blessings of tranquillity and good order, the wholesome and independent sway of the conscience, and the legitimate domi-

nion of an accountability, which owns no allegiance but to an unearthly sovereign, and knows no heresy but the disruption of social ties and moral obligations.

OBITUARY.

It is with feelings of deep and unfeigned regret, we announce the death of the Right Rev. John Jebb, Lord Bishop of Limerick, Ardfer, and Aghadoc.

This distinguished prelate had been educated at the diocesan school of Derry, and from that was admitted a student of Trinity College, Dublin, in the year 1792, under the tuition of the late Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Magee. The talent of the pupil soon attracted the notice of his tutor, and a friendship early commenced, which was terminated only by the death of the Archbishop. More distinguished from classical than scientific attainments, Mr. Jebb, after obtaining a scholarship, became an active member of the Historical Society, and his first publication originated in the honorable but melancholy duty having been assigned to him, of delivering a speech from the chair, in memory of two members of the body, his own particular and intimate friends. The church was from an early period the choice of Mr. Jebb, but the unfortunate state of the country, and the necessity of substituting the duties of the soldier for the studies of the candidate for orders, delayed his ordination till January 1799. He was ordained a dean by Dr. Mathew Young, Bishop of Clonfert, in the chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, with many of his intimate associates, on a peculiarly interesting occasion, when the Fellow of highest character in the university, just raised to the episcopal bench, performed the first act of his sacred office before that society of which he had long been the pride and the ornament. Mr. Jebb's character was so fully established even at this early age, that immediately on his ordination, two flattering proposals were made to him; the present Bishop of Ferns, acting as the confidential friend of the then Bishop of Ferns, Dr. Cleaver, offered him a curacy in that diocese, and a special recommendation to the diocesan; and Mr. Alexander Knox made a similar offer for the Bishop of Kilmore, Dr. Broderick. Fortunately for his future prospects, Mr. Jebb accepted the latter offer, and commenced his ministerial labors as curate of Swadlinbar. On his promotion to the archepiscopal see of Cashel, Dr. Broderick gave a signal proof of his discernment by his taking with him to Cashel the curates so recommended unto him—Mr. Jebb, and the Rev. Irwin Whitty, who lately fell a victim to the ferocious assassins of the

South of Ireland. Mr. Jebb remained for several years at Cashel as reader of the cathedral, and there had not only the advantage of the archbishop's society, but also considerable assistance in his studies from the diocesan library, of which he made constant use. The only publication which appeared during this period was a sermon preached before Lord Hardwicke, President to the Association for discountenancing vice, and promoting the knowledge and practice of the Christian religion. The sermon is written with great elegance ; and the miscellaneous notes attest the variety of the resources upon which he had been drawing for information. In the year 1810, the archbishop had an opportunity of shewing his estimation of Mr. Jebb, and he presented him to the valuable living of Abington. But so short-sighted are all our views, this apparently most advantageous preferment seems to have laid the grounds for a premature decay. The absolute retirement of the glebe house forbidding all society, and the variety of parochial duty requiring active exertion, encouraged the too studious habits of Mr. Jebb, and exercise was only taken irregularly and from compulsion. At Abington, however, commenced that intimacy with the Rev. Chas. Forster, which has cheered the declining years of his life by the sympathies of private friendship, such as seldom are exhibited in this heartless world ; this friend resigning the charms of society dearly prized, and the enjoyment of exuberant spirits to the call of duty, and devoting six years of life to watch the couch of this suffering invalid. The Rector of Abington published a volume of practical sermons, and Biblical literature, works too well known and too highly appreciated to need any panegyric here. Soon after the publication of Biblical literature, Archbishop Broderick had another opportunity of showing his favorable opinion of the author, by appointing him archdeacon of the diocese, upon which Mr. Jebb took the degrees of B.D. and D.D. in the University of Dublin. Higher preferment, however, awaited him, and on the removal of Dr. Elrington to the see of Ferns, the bishoprick of Limerick was conferred upon Dr. Jebb. Called by his turn of duty to attend the Imperial Parliament, the bishop took an active part in the public business. Charges of the grossest misconduct were unblushingly made against the Irish Church ; and from the effrontery with which they were brought forward, very generally believed.

At this critical moment the Bishop of Limerick stepped forward in defence of the charge committed to his trust, and delivered in the House of Peers an elaborate vindication of the Irish clergy, which was subsequently published. Could any statements, however clear, any arguments however impregnable, have conquered the hostility which prejudice and ignorance, bigotry and irreligion, had excited against the Established Church, this speech must have been successful—as it was, it delayed for a time the blow, and left to a reformed parliament

the honor of subverting, as far as in them lay, the interests of true religion in this country. At this period no prelate of the united Church occupied a more distinguished place in the public esteem, than the Bishop of Limerick: his society was eagerly sought by all, by the young and the old, the learned and the gay, the statesman and the divine. Though cold and reserved in manner at first, he entered into conversation with great animation, and had the happy talent of bringing forward the various treasures of his mind in the way best adapted to the acquirements of the individuals with whom he conversed. He interested all, and while he amused, he instructed them. This career of exertion and utility was destined to be short. Four years after his appointment to the episcopal bench, in the early part of the summer of 1827, he was seized with a paralytic stroke while sitting at dinner and apparently in good health. As soon as removal was possible, the bishop was taken to England for change of air and better advice—and he never returned. In the latter end of the year 1828, considerable hopes were entertained of his recovery; when as his strength increased, he was induced to take so active a part in the political discussions on the Roman Catholic question. Firmly convinced that his duty as a Christian bishop obliged him to oppose the measures then in agitation, he devoted his time and his pen to the exposure of the dangers which such changes threatened. The exertion was too much for his feeble frame; and in the ensuing summer a second paralytic attack put an end to every hope of permanent recovery. While the body was thus crippled, the mind remained in all its vigour, in full possession of—

—————Whate'er of mental grace,
Of candor, love, or sympathy divine;
Whate'er of fancy's ray, or friendship's flame

had adorned it in his days of health. The bishop pursued his studies of the Sacred Scriptures—read with avidity the literary productions of the day—gave assistance to several authors in their theological publications, which has been gratefully acknowledged with the gratitude it deserved; and he prepared for publication one of his earlier works, which appeared under the title of *Practical Theology*. He edited Dr. Townson's *Discourses*, and Dr. Phelan's works, to which are prefixed memoirs of the authors; also Bishop Burnet's *Lives*, and a selection of practical tracts, under the title of *Piety without Asceticism*. The energies of the mind never seem to have sunk for a moment under the bodily suffering; to use a quotation applied on another occasion by the bishop himself, "*Nunquam fuit ex toto otiosus, sed aut legens aut scribens aut orans, aut meditans aut aliquid utilitatis pro communi laborans.*" His religion indeed was such as became a Christian prelate—it was unobtrusive, but influencing the whole man; it was to be witnessed in private, not forced upon the public

notice ; it was truly piety without asceticism, devotion without superstition, seriousness without hypocrisy. During six years of disease and suffering, no expression of impatience, no murmur of discontent escaped his lips ; it was his Heavenly Father's will, and he submitted. At length the earthly tabernacle mouldered away ; exhausted nature gradually sunk to rest.

————— Sure the last end
Of the good man is peace. — How calm his exit :
Night dews fall not more gently to the ground—
Nor weary worn out winds expire so soft,

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
AND
Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXVIII. FEBRUARY, 1834.

VOL. III.

REVIEW OF THE LIFE OF WILLIAM COWPER, Esq.*

IN A LETTER TO THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

Unhappy Cowper! whether living or dead, the undeserving victim of the good intentions of his friends! His grave, if it were protected from the officiousness of well-meaning people, such as the compiler of this biography, would be adorned as becomes a Christian poet's sepulchre. Religion would plant and cherish there the sweetest flowers from the banks of Kidron and Siloam, and all the fragrant gems of Carmel and of Sharon; elegant learning would mingle with them the choicest bloom of Tempe and Helicon; and British taste would bring from his country's glades and meadows "their quaint enamelled eyes,"

"And call the vales, and bid them hither cast
Their bells and flow'rets of a thousand hues,"

to deck the sod that his relics have consecrated.

But his friends and admirers will not have it so; they are determined that a monument shall be raised to his honour; they have erected a pillar on his grave, and have sculptured thereon more frightful forms than any that ever barbarous superstition daubed upon the legend of her savage, self-tormenting, and fiend-encountering saints; sullen and haggard Melancholy; Madness with eyes out-bursting from his shaven head, with foaming mouth and chained and writhing limbs; deep-damned Despair and Suicide, driven and derided by torturing demons; and many monstrous and mysterious things, that the heart sickens to look upon, and the tongue refuses to describe! Behold the column with which they have loaded the hapless poet's resting place! And around it they have planted flowers—sickly white poppies, brew-

* The Life of William Cowper, Esq.; Compiled from his Correspondence and other authentic sources of Information. By Thomas Taylor. Third edition, with numerous additions. Seely and Burnside. 1833.

ing delirium; henbane and hemlock, breathing out poison; the shrieking mandrake, and the hideous hellebore! Common Sense and Delicacy are shocked at their handy-work; Taste and Learning turn away for shame; and Religion, at a distance, weeps as she looks on and hears the scoffs with which the profane are insulting herself and her bard.

We would have Cowper known only as the author of his poems. If it were in my power, I would hinder the rising generation from knowing any thing more about him than that he wrote them, and what more of his character the poems themselves declare. For nearly all the rest of his history, it should be shut up in the journals of medical science, convinced that it is injurious information, both from the distressing nature of the details, and, above all, from the way in which it has been published and descanted on, without yielding a jot of useful knowledge to any one but a physician.

I cannot avoid thinking, that the cause of pure and undefiled religion has suffered much by the publication of the wretched Cowper's story, both from the perverseness of its enemies, and the unwise zeal of its friends. The former have discovered, or think they have discovered, that his religion drove him mad, or at least that it was the great aggravation of his madness; and from this position they have arrived, by a process of reasoning known to none but themselves, at the conclusion, that heartfelt religion has a tendency to produce insanity in all, and is a symptom of insanity wherever it shows itself. It is clear that this notable conclusion owes its favourable reception to something else than the logic on which it is built; nor does any person, except he be almost mad himself, suppose that it is a conclusion at all from any premises with which the history of Cowper can supply him. Such people know very well that other things have been the proximate causes and materials of insanity to many men; such as the intensity of conjugal and parental affection, the excitements of commercial and scientific enterprise, the ardour of learning, the cares of power and responsible office, the tumults and disappointments of love and ambition. These cavillers know well that these things have driven multitudes crazy, in the same way in which religion is supposed to have deranged him, (that is, not as originating, but as determining and aggravating his insanity in a system predisposed to derangement,) and yet they would pronounce that man most stupid and irrational who should draw the like conclusion against any of them, that they pretend to draw against experimental religion. The strength of this argument is in the black depravity of the human heart, which is "enmity against God," and "desperately wicked."

The proper mode of replying to such a conclusion is to deny it, and to continue to let our light shine before men, that they, seeing our good works, may glorify our Father who is in heaven. But there have been found good people who have thought otherwise; they have taken the alarm at this formidable inference, and

not content with denying that, they have clamourously denied the position from which it seems to be deduced, maintaining with all their might that Cowper's melancholy was not a religious melancholy at all, and that religion can never be proved to have any thing to do with it. Thus they have done harm to the cause of godliness in two ways: first, by giving to this wretched reasoning an importance and respectability that it could never otherwise have possessed; and, secondly, by failing to establish what they have undertaken to prove. By attacking the premiss so bitterly, they have seemed to allow that the conclusion follows naturally enough from it; and by failing to demonstrate their own assertion, they have afforded a louder triumph to the enemies of that religion they have wished to defend; and thus the question, *Has the religion of the heart a tendency to make men insane?* is jumbled up with another question that has no connection with it—*Is Cowper's derangement to be attributed to his religious views?*

This blunder appears very glaring in the reasons for which some sage gentleman professes to have published, in the year 1816, the whole of that memoir, which Cowper wrote at some period of his life, of his former miseries and experiences, and of which Mr. Hayley, in his life of the poet, gives, with laudable delicacy and good sense, an obscure mention, (Vol. I. p. 94. Ed. 1812,) a publication which served only to shock the good, and afford a subject of profane merriment to the bad.

The editor speaks, in his preface, of "an impression on the minds of many that Cowper's derangement had, from the commencement, assumed the form and character of a religious despondency;" and then goes on to say, "It was a debt of justice to religion to evince that such an impression is contrary to the truth; and that the oft repeated calumny which pretends that piety has a direct tendency to produce insanity, can derive no support from the facts of this interesting case."

I do not envy the logical acumen of that man who could suppose that the inquiry, whether Cowper's was a religious despondency, or no, could affect the question, whether piety tends to produce insanity, or no; and who could persuade himself he was discharging a debt to religion, in dragging to the light a document which, we venture say, every candid person will agree with us in declaring incapable of serving either the cause of piety, or the memory of the poet; but certain to do harm both to the one and the other.

We find Mr. Thomas Taylor labouring under the same confusion of ideas, and at the outset of his work he remarks:—

"In confutation of those who attribute, or at the least, endeavour to attribute Cowper's malady to his religious views, that, viewed as an originating cause, or in any other light, they can never be proved to have had any connexion with it."

The same position he takes care to repeat in different parts of

his work; and the last chapter, which he is pleased to call a chapter of the Christian philosophy of the volume, he uses many hard words against those who differ from him. He pronounces (page 450) that all those individuals who give credit to such assertions as these—

“That Cowper’s mind was surrounded by superstition; that his nervous disease was deepened into a religious horror by his opinions; that the flood of light which burst upon his mind at his conversion, was nothing but the false fire of insanity; that the transport he experienced after his conversion was the mere natural consequence of highly-wrought feeling, to which the gloom he subsequently experienced was to be ascribed.”

He pronounces that individuals, who can give credit to such assertions as these, must feel “an intense aversion to every thing like evangelical religion, and real spirituality of mind.”

Again—

“There can be little doubt that the individuals who, in spite of all that has had been, or can be urged, continue to ascribe Cowper’s melancholy to his religion, because that seemed to be the point on which his mental hallucination turned, would, had it related to any other subject, and had his religion been of the same character, have condemned it with equal rancour, as madness and folly.”

I do not much admire the amiableness of these expressions, nor can I quite understand the crime that these persons are charged with. It is natural that Mr. Taylor should employ all his powers to convince his readers, and that he should be little pleased to lose his trouble; but it is too bad to be angry with them for their insensibility, not only to what he has urged, but to all that he has not urged. Mr. Taylor, however, does not wish to be thought an amiable gentleman; for he tells us (p. 460)—

“Unhappily, the arch-deceiver has been most successful amongst that class who are deservedly esteemed the most amiable, and these are almost the only persons who are likely to attribute Cowper’s malady to his religion.”

And he winds up all his harsh observations with an implicit anathema, in the same breath with an apology for the length of them, which apology I certainly think very ill-timed, but am grieved to see so ill-expressed:—

“The great danger there is that these sober, temperate, and respectable individuals, who are thus opposed to the Gospel, and who regard Cowper’s malady as the effect of his religion, should persist in their error to their final and irrevocable ruin, will, it is hoped, be admitted as a sufficient apology, for the lengthened observations we have made on this subject.”

Now what is the opinion he condemns? If any one should say that the only cause of Cowper’s insanity was that he was a

religious man, and that if he had not been a religious man he would never have been deranged at all in any way, thus making religion the first and last cause of his aberration of mind, I should pronounce that person either deprived of reason, or blasphemously impious. That I do not think such a one exists, nor is it against such a fancied opponent that Mr. Taylor is so angry, but against certain amiable, sober, temperate, and respectable individuals, who never could maintain so monstrous an opinion, but who are equally unwilling to believe that the poet's religious views, "viewed either as an originating cause, or in any other light, can never be proved to have had any connection with his malady."

What then, my readers are ready to ask, are my sentiments on this subject? My answer is, that I am not discussing the subject at all. My object, at present, is to protest earnestly against two unreasonable and mischievous mistakes. I maintain, in the first place, that the decision of this question, whatever it may be, can in no wise countenance the horrible calumny that piety tends to insanity; and must look upon the anxiety and the discussions which this mistake has led some ill-judging but well-intentioned persons into, to be a forsaking, and not a defence of the glorious cause of the Gospel. I maintain, in the next place, that I am at perfect liberty to examine the question, and to determine it as may appear most reasonable to me, without forfeiting the character of a Christian or an honest reviewer. These things I maintain, in spite of all that wrong-headed biographers and panegyrists have said about the matter, and in spite of the implied anathema of Mr. Thomas Taylor; and repeat it, that the way in which the question has been exposed and disputed, has done serious injury to vital religion and the most unfortunate Cowper, and has deeply grieved many sober, temperate, and respectable persons, and myself among the number. It is my most sincere opinion, after a careful weighing of the subject, that the views of Cowper's case, which I have quoted from page 456 of this biography, so far from being a sure sign of "intense aversion," may be held along with an intense affection "for every thing like evangelical religion and real spirituality of mind."

My sentiments on these points will best appear in the course of the observations I have further to make. The great object of Mr. Taylor is to set before us the *religious* biography of Cowper, and it is greatly insisted upon that he was a most memorable example of the dealing of the Eternal Spirit with a sinner's soul; that his conversion was a signal and strongly-marked case of the power of Divine Grace to produce a sudden and satisfactory change; that he was a man highly favoured by close and blissful communion with God; and that upon the whole, notwithstanding much that is unusual and awfully mysterious in the dealings of God with his soul, his life is a record of high Christian attainments and sound Christian experience.

One reason we have already noticed, why several of the

biographers of Cowper so strenuously deny that his religious feelings had any connexion with his insanity; namely, a confused opinion that the interests of religion require this statement of his case. Another reason for the same thing is, that the soundness and the depth of his Christian experience may shine forth without a cloud.

If it be allowed that his views of religion were either the cause or the materials of his madness, it will no longer appear so certain that his awful convictions of sin, and the seraphic rapture of his joy and faith, were the undoubted work of the transforming and purifying spirit of God. That he was deranged, and most dreadfully deranged, is admitted—but not about religion: and the work and progress of conversion, though confessedly closely contemporaneous with the last, and most frightful period of his insanity, and the emersion of his faculties, was all throughout distinct from them, and not to be confounded with them.

At twenty-one, Cowper entered the Temple, and soon after his settlement there he sunk into a state of mind that we find thus described, page 14, in the poet's own words:—

“Not long after my settlement in the Temple, I was struck with such a dejection of spirits, as none but those who have felt the same can have the least conception of. Day and night I was upon the rack; lying down in horror, and rising up in despair.”

And in this state he continued nearly twelve months. At length a change of scene was recommended to him, and he went to Southampton, where he spent several months; and his feelings are thus described by Mr. Taylor, again, in the poet's own words:—

“Soon after our arrival, we walked to a place called Freemantle, about a mile from the town. The morning was clear and calm; the sun shone brightly upon the sea, and the country on the border of it was the most beautiful I had ever seen. Here it was, that on a sudden, as if another sun had been created that instant in the heavens, on purpose to dispel sorrow and vexation of spirit, I felt the weight of all my misery taken off; my heart became light and joyful in a moment. I could have wept with transport, had I been alone. I must needs believe that nothing less than the Almighty fiat could have filled me with such inexpressible delight; not by a gradual dawning of peace, but, as it were, by a flash of His life-giving countenance.* I think I remember something like a glow of gratitude to the Father of mercy for this unexpected blessing, and that I ascribed it, at first, to His gracious acceptance of my prayers. But Satan, and my own

* I quote this sentence as it is given in the publication of the complete document, and not as Mr. Taylor has altered it.

wicked heart, quickly persuaded me that I was indebted for my deliverance to nothing but a change of scene, and the amusing varieties of the place. By this means he turned the blessing into a poison, and away went all my thoughts of devotion."

The unhappy Cowper's depression of mind hung upon him with varying oppressiveness, till a situation was obtained for him as clerk of the journals to the House of Lords, which his friends and he hoped he would find well fitted to his delicate and diffident mind: but an unexpected order to attend a summons to the bar of the house, to be examined as to his fitness for the post, plunged him into new horror and perplexity:—

"A thunderbolt," says he, "would have been more welcome to me than this intelligence. My continual misery at length brought on a nervous fever. Quiet forsook me by day, and peace by night: even a finger raised against me seemed more than I could bear."

At length he meditated suicide, as the only escape he could see, from the agony of appearing in public; which horrible act he thrice attempted, and was forced to give up the office before the day of his examination:—

"Thus ended," says his biographer, "his connexion with the House of Lords: unhappily, however, his miseries did not end here. Despair still inflicted on him its deepest sting, and he saw not how it could be extracted. Grief poured its full tide of anguish into his heart, and he could perceive nothing before him but an interminable prospect of misery."

Here now is said to have begun the decisive work of conversion. Mr. Taylor continues to extract from Cowper's memoir of himself:—

"Now, therefore, a new scene opened upon me. My sins were set in array before me, and I began to see and feel that I had lived without God in the world. One moment I thought myself shut out from mercy by one chapter, and the next by another. The sword of the Spirit seemed to guard the tree of life against my touch, and to flame against me in every avenue by which I attempted to approach it. I particularly remember, that the parable of the barren fig-tree was, to me, an inconceivable source of anguish. I applied it to my own case, with a strong persuasion that it was a curse pronounced on me by the Saviour. In a word, I saw myself a sinner altogether."

His despair deepened, and he soon became haunted by the dreadful thought that he had committed the unpardonable sin, and pertinaciously maintained that he was condemned to endure the wrath of God to all eternity, for having omitted properly to improve the mercy of God toward him at Southampton. Soon afterwards, his shocking malady became so evident that he was

conveyed to the private asylum for lunatics, kept by Dr. Cotton, at St. Albans. There, we are told, he lay for five months, in the most gloomy and desponding state; tormented with conviction of sin, and despair of mercy. In process of time, his brother visited him, and protested so strongly that he was under a delusion, that, says Cowper—

“I could not help giving some attention to him. I burst into tears, and cried out, ‘If it be a delusion, then am I the happiest of mortals!’ Something like a ray of hope shot into my heart, but still I was afraid to indulge it.”

The ray of hope, however, became brighter and brighter.

“Every moment came, as it were, fraught with hopes. I felt that I was not utterly doomed to destruction.”

“But the happy period, which was to shake off my fetters, and afford me a clear discovery of the free mercy of God, in Christ Jesus, was now arrived. I flung myself into a chair near the window, and seeing a Bible there, ventured once more to apply to it for comfort and instruction. The first verse I saw was the 25th of the 3d of Romans: ‘Whom God hath set forth, to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.’ Immediately I received strength to believe, and the full beams of the sun of righteousness shone upon me. I saw the sufficiency of the atonement he had made, for my pardon and complete justification. In a moment I believed, and received the Gospel.”

“For many succeeding weeks, tears would be ready to flow if I did but speak of the Gospel, or mention the name of Jesus. To rejoice day and night was all my employment. Too happy to sleep much, I thought it but lost time that was spent in slumber.”

“My physician, ever watchful, and apprehensive for my welfare,” was now alarmed, lest the sudden transition from despair to joy, should terminate in a fatal frenzy. But the Lord was my strength and my song, and was become my salvation.”

Dr. Cotton's apprehensions in a short time subsided, and—

“On the 17th June, 1765,” says Mr. Taylor, “having spent more than eighteen months at St. Alban's, partly in the bondage of despair, and partly in the liberty of the Gospel, he took leave of the place, and set out for Cambridge.”

This is the account Mr. Taylor gives of the poet's conversion, which I am persuaded he considers a signal and edifying example of the power of Divine grace, and which he has endeavoured, I am sure, with the sincerest intentions, to render edifying to his readers. But I do not think he has dealt quite fairly with his readers, or acquitted himself in the most faithful manner in his office of biographer.

He has given this account entirely in the words of the poet, yet without making a single remark about the document from which he has extracted them, and which is all the authority that he and his readers have to rely upon: and, while appearing to employ the very language of Cowper, has kept back many of his most important thoughts; in doing which, he has, indeed, displayed infinitely more prudence and delicacy than the zealous individual to whom we are indebted for the whole of the production, but yet not the same degree of candour.

It is as clear as the sun at noon-day, to those who read this auto-biography of Cowper, that all the wretchedness and despair which oppressed him from the time he entered the Temple, to the fall paroxysm of madness at St. Albans, were firmly believed by him to have been the chosen means which the Spirit of God vouchsafed to employ, in His dealings with his soul, to bring him to the knowledge of the truth.

After describing his state of mind as like the feelings of a criminal at the place of execution, for every day for more than half a-year together, and telling us that his first reflections, when he "awoke in the morning, were horrible, and full of wretchedness."

He at length began to entertain the horrid thought of self-destruction, and thus he writes:—

"Being at Richard's Coffee-house, at breakfast, I read the newspaper, and in it a letter, which the farther I perused it, the more closely it engaged my attention. I cannot now recollect the purport of it; but before I had finished it, it appeared demonstratively true to me that it was a libel or satire upon me. The author appeared to be acquainted with my purpose of self-destruction, and to have written that letter, on purpose to secure and hasten the execution of it. My mind *probably* at this time began to be disordered. *However it was*, I was *certainly* given up to a strong delusion. I said within myself, 'Your cruelty shall be gratified—you shall have your revenge.'"

Then follows a long and heart-rending account of the many preparations and attempts that he made to destroy himself; and how he was hindered, again and again, by Divine interposition—by sudden impulses from heaven, that were as suddenly withdrawn, when their purpose was answered; by instantaneous convulsion in his limbs; by supernatural contraction of his fingers; by an invisible hand, that swayed down the poisoned bowl! He tells us how a voice said distinctly, three times, while he was hanging, "Tis over!" and adds, "I am sure of the fact." Harrassed with sleepless nights, and days of uninterrupted misery, he was now—

"Strongly tempted to use laudanum, not as a poison, but as an opiate, to compose my spirits—to stupify an awakened and feeling mind; but God forbade it, who would have nothing to interfere with the quickening work he

had begun in me." "I bought a ballad of one who was singing it in the street, because I thought it was written on me." "If, for a moment, a book or a companion stole away my attention from myself, a flash from hell seemed to be thrown into my mind immediately, and I said, within myself, 'What are these things to me, who am damned?' In a word, I saw myself a sinner altogether, and every way a sinner."

He now began to wish for madness, and at length, says he, "that distemper of mind which I had so ardently wished for, actually seized me."

He was carried to St. Albans.—

"It will be proper to draw a veil over the secrets of my prison-house; let it suffice to say, that the low state of body and mind to which I was reduced was perfectly well calculated to humble the natural vain-glory and pride of my heart. These are the efficacious means which Infinite Wisdom thought meet to make use of for that purpose."

Now what can any sober person think of the wisdom of those who draw out of materials such as these, an ostentatious narrative of a sound and signal conversion? What can be concluded of the state of mind of the author of this auto-biography, we will not say at the period described only, but at the time in which he wrote it? Had the writer correct views of his own case, through all its stages? Was he a fit person to trace out the dealings of the Holy Spirit with his soul, in bringing him to the knowledge of the truth? Could he be in a wholesome condition of mind when he put down, thus minutely, particulars of so horrible and sickening a character, and made statements such as he has recorded? And is Mr. Taylor treating his readers with fairness, when, without a single word about the character, the extent, the time of writing, or any other thing belonging to this composition, which is the only authority on which he rests, and which supplies the very words he uses, he extracts from it what and where he pleases, and exhibits to his readers this, as a case of wonderful and edifying Christian experience; and a sound and glorious conversion? And yet this is put forth as if the honour of the Gospel were to stand or fall with the reception of Mr. Taylor's view of the subject; while all the sober, amiable, and respectable people who shall be bold enough to differ with him, are pronounced enemies to Divine truth, and running headlong to their final and inevitable ruin!

I ask, is the evidence sufficient, on which all this is propounded as valuable biographical information; and propounded, too, in such a tone? If the document on which Mr. Taylor relies is to be admitted as good evidence, there can be no reason to receive one part of it rather than another: we must receive it all or none; and in receiving it, receive what I cannot help thinking absurdity, if not impiety. It must be believed that when the despairing hypochondriac had arrived in the country from his

dismal dwelling in the metropolis, and walked out on a clear calm morning, in the most beautiful country he had ever beheld, and the sweet sunshine that deluged all the landscape with delight, made its way also to the heart that gloom and seclusion from the loveliness of nature had sickened, spreading a sudden rapture through those exquisitely sensible nerves, that never felt either joy or sorrow but in extremes. It must be believed that the change was produced by nothing less than the Almighty *fiat*, and an instantaneous flash of his life-giving countenance. This was Cowper's solemn conviction, at the time when he wrote this account, in after life, although it was not his conviction when it happened :—

“ I *must needs*,” says he—(*must needs* is used elsewhere in the *present* time in this memoir)—“ I *must needs* believe that nothing less than the Almighty *fiat* could have filled me with such inexpressible delight.”

“ I think I remember *something like* a glow of gratitude; but Satan and my own wicked heart quickly persuaded me that I was indebted for my deliverance to nothing but a change of scene and the amusing varieties of the place.”

The writer considered it to have been a crime, the suggestion of the prince of darkness, to think that a change of scene or the amusing varieties of the place produced that enjoyment, or that anything less than the Almighty *fiat* could have wrought out the deliverance.

It is worthy of being observed, that this memoir of the poet was written during what is considered as the best time, both of his intellectual and religious life—in the interval between his recovery at St. Albans, and the next attack of his malady, which is as plain as possible from abundant internal evidence in the composition itself.

I have already remarked, that the convictions of sin, and the rapture following them, that are so strongly insisted on, were contemporaneous with the paroxysm of indomitable madness, and the re-establishment of the unhappy sufferer's faculties, except that the former, respectively, somewhat preceded the latter, as far as we can gather from the accounts. And it must also be remarked, that the transport was so far from resembling the calm and heavenly ‘peace and joy in believing,’ which it is the privilege of God's accepted children to receive, that Dr. Cotton was alarmed, lest the sudden transition ‘should terminate in a *fatal frenzy*,’ and thus render abortive all that his skill and patience had been employed to accomplish.

So much concerning the signal and instructive conversion of Cowper. We hope our readers will excuse our having dwelt so long upon the subject, for several good reasons. In the first place, it seems to devolve upon me, in reviewing Mr. Taylor's work, to point out, in the spirit of a Christian examiner, one deficiency, of importance in biographical diligence or fairness; and I cannot help thinking this of importance.

Then, I wish to say a word in defence of those sober, amiable, and respectable people, whom Mr. Taylor attacks, to show that Mr. Taylor's views of the religious character of Cowper are not fundamental articles of faith, and that a sincere enquirer may, after all, arrive at the conclusion—

“That Cowper's mind was surrounded by superstition; that his nervous disease was deepened into a religious horror by his opinions; that the flood of light which burst upon his mind at his supposed conversion was nothing but the false fire of insanity; and that the transport he experienced after it, was the natural consequence of high-wrought feeling, to which the gloom he subsequently experienced was to be ascribed.”

We wish to show that a sincere enquirer may give credit to all this, without being convicted of “intense aversion to every thing like evangelical religion, and real spirituality of mind.”

But I have a better reason. I am sincerely grieved to think that the good cause, which all should have at heart, may be injured by such advocates as this biographer, however well-meaning he may be. Sure I am that there was neither judgment nor delicacy in the publication of Cowper's own memoir of his early life; although it was given to the world professedly as a duty done to religion, and to supply to the Christian public their great lack of a biography of Cowper, confined especially to his religious character. In Mr. Taylor's book there is far more delicacy displayed, but no more judgment; nay, he is even a more determined panegyrist of Cowper, as a spiritual man, than the other, as appears from the notes of the latter, compared with the general tone of Mr. Taylor's book. Care should be taken not to put arms in the hands of the enemies of religion. Now, although no possible view of Cowper's case can supply irreligious men with any thing like an argument, yet prejudice gladly avails herself of a subject for noisy declamation; and vice makes much of a pretence to justify herself, when they see a convert, made in bedlam, held forward as a glorious example of the power of Divine grace, and the recollections of a hypochondriac soberly published as an improving religious memoir.

To counterbalance this danger of doing mischief, the religious biographer should be sure of having great advantages in his subject; some eminent example of Christian practice and achievement; some satisfactory sequel of Christian experience and attainments; some glorious scene of final Christian triumph. What, then, are these counterbalancing advantages in this case? We shall see.

It is not pretended that there is anything satisfactory in the Christian career of the unhappy poet, except during the nine years that intervened between his leaving St. Albans and his next attack of insanity. At the end of that period he again was plunged into blackest melancholy, that was fed with this strange infernal fancy, that he was cut off from all hope of sal-

vation, and doomed to everlasting fire, because at the time when he was prompted, as he thought, by the Spirit of God, to put an end to his own life, and return his soul to him who gave it, he had rebelliously refused to do so! Under the influence of this horrible conviction, he remained shut up in anguish unspeakable for five years of deepest gloom, and it was five years more before he recovered the complete use of his intellectual faculties on any subject; on this subject he never recovered it; but his persuasion remained unaltered, with many intervening fits of severe nervous fever and derangement, from the year 1773 till 1794, when his malady returned in all its tremendous fierceness, and never left him, except for a very few and brief lucid intervals, till the day of his death in 1800. During all that time, as far as we can gather from Mr. Taylor's volume, he considered himself shut out from all Christian privileges; he would not pray, he would not read the Bible, or hear it read; he would not attend either public or private worship; and in general, he looked upon religion as to him a forbidden subject. Nor did the light of reason, as it sometimes happens before death, rally its last expiring strength, and give one flickering blaze:—he died—and gave no sign!

But these nine golden years of the lamented poet's Christian course will supply rich materials for his religious biographer—will they not? I do not discover anything! I see nothing of the Christian labourer, nothing of the Christian soldier, nothing of the Christian sufferer. I read of no projects formed, no work done, no temptations resisted, no pains endured, no dangers encountered, no wide sphere of usefulness, no regular post or occupation. Not even was his pen employed, until Mr. Newton got him to work, to join him in the composition of the Olney Hymns, a short time before his relapse into his dreadful malady in 1773, which terminated his labours in that way, when he had written sixty-eight hymns. He was an unseen, unknown monk, practising the ambiguous and inglorious piety of the cloister. I am not speaking here in disparagement of Cowper; nor do I say that with the constitution of body and mind which he possessed, he could have been more than what he was, without a miracle. I am only showing that his life and experiences afford no materials for a religious memoir that must, perforce, be thrust in among the volumes which contain the instructive and inspiring lives of fathers, and saints, and confessors. Is there any thing to justify the risk of bringing dishonour on the cause of piety, by inducing perverse calumniators to confound the reality of divine influence with the soundness of this unhappy man's experiences? Is there here so much that is valuable for Christian example and encouragement, as to justify the attempt of friends and panegyrists to canonize a man, who was confessedly shut out, for the greater part by far of his religious career, from all the communion, and faith, and hope of the Gospel, by a dreadful insanity; or to

justify the pushing forward to the view of all, what all would willingly forget—the detail of that insanity with which this work abounds, and to which it is constantly alluding, as a part, and a mysterious part, of the dealings of God with his soul?

The perplexities into which both the biographer and his readers are led, by studying Cowper's life as a succession of Christian experience, are endless; and when the mind is reconciled to the idea of a conversion in the lunatic asylum, the dereliction that he suffered for the last twenty-seven years of his life is an inexplicable enigma. Mr. Taylor decides the matter at last by telling us, that it was most probably a dispensation of Providence, intended to teach us that God is sovereign, and has a right to do as seemeth him good, without asking the consent of his creatures. In another place we are told—

“That the force or beauty of Cowper's example is not in any degree diminished by the hallucination under which he laboured; since, in fact, the influence of religion on his mind was never suspended, even when, under the influence of hopeless depression, he forbore to pray. The piety that shines through all his despondency, and his entire submission to the Divine will, even though, as he erroneously supposed, it was his own destruction, prove, that through the whole of his bewilderment his heart was singularly right with God.”

This is valuable biography, and a profitable exposition of the power of religion, indeed!

It would become us better, perhaps, instead of speaking of Cowper's malady as a mysterious visitation, and an inexplicable appointment of Providence, as Mr. Taylor so frequently does in this volume, and amusing ourselves with finding out wise reasons for so extraordinary a dispensation, to confess that we know nothing about it, and content ourselves with numbering it among those accidental irregularities that seem always to accompany the operation of general laws, with which Almighty God, in His wisdom, does not see fit *manifestly* to interfere. Why should the derangement of the unhappy poet be attributed to a special and mysterious Providence, or be jumbled up with the character and interests of religion, any more than that of other hypochondriacs? And is Mr. Taylor really in earnest, or does he suppose that he is promoting the cause of piety, when he gravely proposes to all the Christian world, as an edifying example for imitation, and as one whose heart was singularly right with God, a man who lived for three-fourths of his Christian career, as it is represented, in the darkness of a delusion that utterly severed him from the Church of Christ, and sent him to appear before his Maker, as far as human knowledge or conjecture can form any conclusion in the case, not as one rejoicing in Christ, and standing on the grounds of the Gospel covenant, but as a maniac, to be left to the uncovenanted mercies of God?

In conclusion, then, I do not see any thing in the life of

Cowper that can be considered as valuable religious biography. If the evidences of the supposed conversion and Christian attainment were much better than they are, still the setting that wretched sufferer forth as a Christian model, would expose vital religion and its possessors to calumny and contempt, which it would be wiser to avoid. But it has been shown that the account of that conversion rests upon but weak authority, namely, upon the recollections of a recovered lunatic, moulded to the notions he possessed at a subsequent period, in which there is clear proof that he was, at the time of writing, unqualified to judge of his former experiences, and under great delusion about them. And for the subsequent period of nine years after his supposed conversion, I cannot see any thing valuable, in a religious view, in the practical part of his character, which sets him above thousands of monks and common-place, sickly, secluded characters, to whom the poet's biographers would ascribe very little or no religion; and as to his religious emotions and experiences, it is known, in the first place, that he wrote the memoir during that period; and in the next place, as I have read, and heard confessed even by his warm admirers, that he was superstitious about dreams and the like; that his notions of Divine influence and devotional feelings were inclined to mysticism and monkery; and above all, that his ideas about Providence were unscriptural, as much so as the doctrines of Stoic fatalism or Epicurean chance, but more absurd than either; and all this, I am certain, can be proved beyond contradiction.

But there is an argument remaining, that must be noticed, to which great importance seems to be attached, for maintaining Cowper's claims to a high place in the religious world—

"Who would not be content," demands Mr. Taylor, "to be in that frame of mind in which Cowper must have lived, when he penned those admirable letters, so full of Christian experience, during the interval between his conversion and his subsequent severe mental attack, a period of nearly nine years."

To this there is this answer; first, that we have not got all his letters; and secondly, that for any thing they prove to the contrary, he might have been as insane about his own personal religion, when he wrote them, as ever he was at any period. When were his poems written—those exquisite poems, that contain so much Christian experience, and Christian truth? Every one of them, when he was insane. Written at the very time when their author conceived that he was excluded from the blessings which the blood of Christ had purchased for all beside, because he had not committed suicide! And yet this constant delusion about himself did not hinder him from writing well and powerfully on those generalities of the truth as it is in Jesus, which he had learned principally, as it appears, from those good men, Mr. Unwin and Mr. Newton.

In one word, I think that Mr. Taylor's volume, as a religious biography, is a useless, and a worse than useless book. Its tendency is to countenance the blunder which confounds the value of Cowper's personal religion, with the value and dignity of all experimental religion. It tends to expose piety to the sneers, although she can fear nothing from the arguments of her foes; and of her friends, although it may perhaps appear edifying to some, it may prove the occasion of error and false taste in religion, if we may so use the word, to others, and of great grief and offence to more; while the discussions it contains and provokes about his insanity, lead to unprofitable, if not decidedly wrong speculations, about the ways of God, and tend to injure the unhappy and aimable poet, by making prominent that part of his story, which all who love and honour his memory would fain have forgotten. In other respects, as a literary history of the poet, and as a skilful condensation of the four volumes of Mr. Hayley, and the two volumes of Dr. Johnson, the relation of the bard, the work has great merit and excellencies. The author pretends to no originality, professing to give only a compilation that may be generally interesting; all which we have great pleasure in testifying that he has done; for the book is highly interesting through every page. Its success with the public is a strong proof of its merit, it being already in the third edition.

T. P. K.

Though not usual with periodicals to insert reviews of works which have not editorial responsibility attached to them, yet, as in other instances the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER has receded from this practice, it leaves now, to T. P. K. all the consequences that may result from the assumption of individuality.—EDITOR.

ON JOHN xvii. 20—26.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—Will you admit into your pages a suggestion with regard to a very interesting and important portion of Scripture? Nothing is so desirable for the Church in general, or for individual Christians, as an acquaintance with the real meaning of the Holy Scriptures, and of every passage contained in them. There is much light, I feel assured, still to be had from an humble, prayerful search after the mind of God as revealed in his word. In searching the Scriptures, there is a happy medium to be observed between, on the one hand, a slavish subserviency to former interpreters, and a licentious disregard of ancient opinions on the other. I would endeavour to be on my guard against either extreme—not be ready to cast aside an interpretation of a passage that had the sanction of those lights of the Church who have gone before, and yet not to reject at once, an interpretation that commended itself to the judgment merely because it was new. I have sometimes ventured, through the medium of your pages, to put forward opinions not in unison with those of generally received commentators, and it might perhaps appear to some hasty observers, that I was falling into the extreme of following novelties. But I would remark, that when I trespass on your pages, and on your readers' time, it is not of course to state those views in which I agree, and find a pleasure in agreeing, with the great company of students of the Bible; but the cases in which I obtrude my sentiments upon you are those few in which, after much consideration, I feel myself forced to differ from generally received opinions. The large measure in which I think with other people, is of course kept back; the small measure in which I think at least that I see reason to differ, is that which is commonly put forward.

I trouble you with these remarks as an introduction, because I do think there is a diseased state of mind very common in the present day, which will be satisfied with nothing but novelty, and quarrels with interpretations of Scripture which have been universally received, merely because they have been so generally received. Against such a diseased state of mind, so productive of error, so sure to subject a man to be tossed about with every wind of doctrine, I would desire to be anxiously on my guard; but yet to take care not to shut myself out from any more clear view of a passage of Scripture which may be presented to my mind.

I doubt not but many of your readers, who are in the habit of searching the Scriptures, have felt occasionally, as I have, much dissatisfaction in reading some passages; unable thoroughly to acquiesce in any interpretation which has been given of them, and yet unable even to suggest any other that appeared more

satisfactory, and that bore more of the stamp of truth. I have long felt thus in reading the latter part of John xvii. from v. 20, to which I now beg leave to direct your attention. All commentators whom I have had an opportunity of consulting, have considered that the unity for which Christ prays in this passage, is an unity to be obtained in this present dispensation, and which it is his prayer that his Church may actually enjoy and exhibit in the present world. I have always put this construction on the passage whilst reading it, until lately, when I have been led to think that his prayer in this part of the chapter is all in reference to the future inheritance, and that the unity of which our Lord speaks is an unity that shall not take place until all the redeemed shall be gathered, and enter together into the joy of the Lord.

I would first state my reasons for being dissatisfied with the interpretation which would suppose the Lord praying for an unity to be enjoyed and exhibited in the present dispensation; and then state the grounds on which I would interpret the prayer in reference to the future state. If this is a prayer for an unity to be enjoyed in this present dispensation, it is a prayer that never has been answered; there never has been that unity in the Church which has been a means of leading the world to believe that the Father sent Christ; on the contrary, there has been that disunion in the Church, which has been a great stumbling-block to the world.

Again, the union prayed for is an union of those believing at that time, and of all those that, to the end of the world, shall believe on Jesus through the word of the first disciples. Now, as these shall live in all the different ages of the world, they never can exhibit a visible unity, such as shall influence the world, until they shall at one time, yet to come, be all gathered together into one place, to partake of one blessedness.

Again, those who interpret this prayer in reference to a present unity, are obliged to interpret the glory spoken of in v. 22, as some thing given to the Church in the present dispensation, inasmuch as it is a means towards the production of the unity for which the Lord prays. "And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given to them, that they may be one, even as we are one." If the oneness is to be in this dispensation, then must the glory which is to produce it be in this dispensation. And, accordingly, most commentators consider the glory which Christ says he has given to his Church, to consist in the power of working miracles conferred on the Apostles, and the measure of light and sanctification conferred upon Christians in this life—a meaning of the word glory not surely borne out by the analogy of Scriptures—a sense that I do not think can be attributed to this word in any other part of Scripture; certainly not in such passages as Rom. viii. 18. "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the *glory* which shall be revealed in us;" or 2 Cor. iv. 17; or Col. iii. 4; 1 Pet. v. 1, &c.; but it is inconsistent with the sense in which the word is evi-

dently used by the Lord in a subsequent verse of this passage which we are considering, v. 24, "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my *glory* which thou hast given me." Surely the glory which the Father has given to the Son in the 24th verse is the same as that which he has given him in the 22d verse. But evidently the glory in verse 24, is the eternal glory yet to be manifested in Christ's future kingdom; and therefore the glory in the 22d verse must be future; and so must also the unity which is to be the result of their possessing that glory. But if we take the unity prayed for, to allude to that glorious consummation, when in the dispensation of the fulness of times he will "gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and in earth," there can be a consistent interpretation given to the whole passage. Then, indeed, shall the whole Church of God, the whole body of believers, gathered throughout all ages, from every corner under heaven, appear glorified together as one body, united in the Father and in the Son: they will then indeed be seen "made perfect in one;" and the world, before whom this glory will be conferred on them, will know that the Father hath sent Jesus, and hath loved his redeemed even as he hath loved the Redeemer. It is when they shall be seen one in the Father and the Son that the extent of the Father's love to them will be known. As Christians are now in this state of grace, that they are sons and heirs, "the world knoweth them not," even as it knows not Christ; but when Christians shall be in their state of glory, then the world will be forced to acknowledge that they are the objects of God's especial love. It is, I should suppose, this phrase, "that the world may believe that thou hast sent me," that has led expositors to think that Christ was speaking of an unity of Christians in this life, which should be influential in leading the world to faith; but we have many similar expressions, which do not denote the conversion of the ungodly to saving faith, but the conviction wrought upon the ungodly when their day of grace was over, as Ex. xiv. 4, "And I will harden Pharaoh's heart, that he shall follow after them; and I will be honoured upon Pharaoh and upon all his host, that the Egyptians may know that I am the Lord."

We have another instance of the ungodly being mentioned as acquainted with the glory bestowed upon the righteous, Luke xiii. 28. "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and ye yourselves cast out." The guilty world, it appears, will see the glory conferred upon the believing people of God, and shall, to their confusion, have a conviction of the truth of that Gospel which they have rejected, and this seems to be what is meant here by the words of our Lord, "that the world may know that thou hast sent me." And I would remark what sublime ideas of the Christian's elevated glory and happi-

ness does this passage, in our Lord's beautiful prayer, convey to us, when interpreted in this way! It represents to us the whole number of those that shall be brought to believe on Jesus as all gathered together—united to each other and to the Father and Son—one body in the Deity—evidently exhibited as loved by the Father, even as he has loved his own Son; and partaking of, and sharing in, the same glory wherewith he hath glorified his own Son; that, as "he hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name," so shall his redeemed brethren of mankind be, by this union with him, placed above every creature that shall dwell in the presence of God; they shall be united with him in judging the world, yea, in judging the angels. "God is faithful, who hath called them into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ." What motives have we here to heavenly mindedness—to living above this world. Well may the Apostle say, "Set your affections on things above, and not on things on the earth, for ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God; when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."

When I have read this beautiful portion of Scripture, according to the received interpretation, I have been dejected by it, considering how little the state of the Church has been in conformity with the supposed meaning of the prayer, and how little prospect there is, in the present age of the world, of the Church exhibiting in time to come any thing more cheering. But when I read it as a prayer to be fulfilled after this present scene shall have passed away, I am filled with hope, and I trust with gratitude to him who hath prepared such glorious things for his Church and people. I am, in some degree, enabled to say, the sufferings, the evils, the dissensions, of this present time, "are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us."

But the great question is, what is the meaning of the passage? Does it, in God's mind, speak of an unity in this world, or of an unity in glory in the world to come? I leave this to the consideration of your readers, praying for the guidance of God's Spirit to them and to myself.

R. D.

TEACHERS AND EXHORTERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—In my letter on the "Use of Gifts," I made some remarks on the evil tendency of certain principles regarding the ministerial office, generally maintained by persons called to subordinate employments in the Church.—I now return to the subject, according to my promise.

No man admires more ardently than I do, those truly reputable men whose talents have, under Divine Providence, enabled them to rise to that sphere in which they have been qualified to move with credit to themselves, and advantage to society. But we cannot conceal the fact that some have been raised to offices in the Church, who, suddenly emerging from the shade of poverty, have grown dizzy with their elevation, and been dazzled with the light by which it was surrounded.—Let me not be misunderstood. I do not estimate respectability by adventitious circumstances. True greatness may be clothed meanly, and lodged in a hovel; but if arrayed in purple, and lord of a palace, it is still the same. It is ever marked by the unassuming simple dignity of deportment that flows from the consciousness of a power which nothing external can give or take away. There is an innate majesty in some minds which cannot be degraded by the lowest stations, or ennobled by the highest. Characterised by a love of knowledge, which no disappointments can quench, and no difficulties successfully oppose, and impelled by the "inspiration of the Almighty" to press forward in his service, they assert for themselves a claim to encouragement and support. Resting on this silent claim, and giving the Church credit for more justice and discernment than she is sometimes found to possess, they remain, diffident and retiring, pining under protracted neglect. Meantime, persons of little minds—the superficial and worthless, who are ever flippant and forward, arrogant to all below, and servile to all above them, pass on rapidly to preferment, and then spurn the associates and benefactors by whose kindness they ascended. These are men, for the most part, destitute of mental stamina; the vain and empty aspirants after the rank of *Gentlemen*, who step (sometimes rather abruptly) from the work-shop into the pulpit. But if they cannot effect their purpose in regard to this or some similar object, they murmur and complain, and despise dominions, and speak evil of dignities. They are radical reformers *until* they can grasp the honors which they have so often denounced as antichristian, and then, far from "bearing their honors meekly," they are of all men the most arrogant. Prerogative with them is but another name for tyranny, and power is perverted to the purposes of insolent oppression.

It is quite natural that men of narrow minds, whose education has been very partial, and not commenced, perhaps, till late in life, should "be lifted up with pride" when raised even a *little* above that humble station to which their intellects and habits were suited :

"A little learning is a dangerous thing :—
Shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,
But drinking deep will sober us again."

But, unhappily, the persons most likely to be inebriated by it are precisely those whom you cannot persuade to have recourse to the only means of recovering themselves from the "condemnation of the devil." They never drink deep enough to learn the humiliating but salutary lesson of their own ignorance and incapacity. These remarks have reference to *hoc genus omne*, in whatever denomination they may be found; for, alas, such troublers of Israel exist in all its tribes. In their case, former poverty furnishes no guarantee for future humility. The very man that once said, "Put me, I pray thee, into the priest's office, that I may eat a piece of bread," proves the most priestly and haughty of all his brethren; most anxiously swells up his little importance: he is to the poor the greatest stranger, and to the rich the greatest parasite.

I am now, Sir, simply illustrating a general principle, which is, that comparatively few can bear a sudden transition from indigence to competence, from a state of ignorance and dependence, to one of reputed learning and popular influence. On this subject the priests of Ireland furnish an instructive lesson. Human nature is the same in every age. Priests made from the "lowest of the people" are no less disposed to be tyrants or the tools of tyrants now than they were in the days of Jeroboam. Would that this domineering spirit were confined to the *novi homines* to whom I have alluded. But alas, we sometimes find it desecrating Protestant pulpits, and exciting disgust or ridicule in persons engaged as Scripture Readers and Local Missionaries. These latter personages, it is true, look up with an evil eye at the pastoral office, and talk loudly and dogmatically of those "Popish" distinctions which "raise one man above the congregation," who, say they, "are all holy, every one of them;" yet no men can be fonder of distinctions and honors than themselves. They cry out for *equality*, because they are too proud to own a superior; not aware, perhaps, that the spirit by which they are actuated is the very same that influences those who are, in the worst sense, lords over God's heritage.

Far be it from me to say, that the Scripture Reader is not a useful character. I believe his services are loudly called for, and that his labours may be very useful. Neither do I wish to insinuate any personal reflections in these remarks. I merely wish to say, that functionaries of this class are peculiarly ex-

posed to the evils to which I have adverted. This may arise, partly from their not being required to pass through any course of mental discipline before their appointment to the office of teachers—a circumstance which I think liable to strong objections. Until a man has learned to perceive clearly, and think accurately, and express his ideas perspicuously, I do not think he should be considered a *safe* person to teach on any subject, much less on subjects of everlasting moment. It is true we want more labourers. But let us take care that those whom we employ be *effective*, and such as the Holy Spirit has qualified for the work. An army is not always powerful in proportion to its numbers. If the camp were crowded with men at once *undisciplined* and self-willed, their presence would be fatal rather than beneficial. I have heard one of the ablest preachers that ever occupied a Protestant pulpit in this city, state that he would rather see a neighbourhood left entirely without the Gospel, than see that Gospel *preached* by an ignorant man. Perhaps he is right. The Holy Spirit never yet sanctified *ignorance*. And it is a fact worthy of notice, that among the Apostles themselves, the man who was incomparably the most useful by his preaching and writings, was, not the unlettered fisherman, however miraculously endued, but the accomplished scholar.

Unsanctified learning may be justly chargeable with inflicting on society very extensive injury. Nevertheless, knowledge is power; and knowledge, consecrated to the glory of God, is the mightiest instrument of good that can be brought to bear on the human race.

In seasons of revival, ignorant, hot-headed preachers are the men that by their extravagance mar the work of God, grieve the Holy Spirit, and stain the triumphs of the Cross. This has been felt and lamented by the people of God in America. A minister of that country, in alluding to this subject, draws a picture, of which we may perhaps find some originals nearer home. “Some *very weak* men,” he remarks, “have seemed to think they were raised up in these latter days to ‘turn the world upside down.’ *Obtuseness of feeling* makes them defy ridicule, and want of becoming moral sentiment enables them to live without pain in the midst of moral ruin.”

I can assure you, Sir, that I do not make these remarks in an invidious spirit. I trust I only seek to promote the cause of Christ. I am contending against what appears to me calculated to dishonor that cause, and to retard, instead of promoting, the spiritual illumination of the world. I confess, when I hear a man preaching in a style so queer, so ludicrous, that the most seriously disposed find it difficult to suppress a smile, I am anxious to rescue the blessed Gospel from a medium of communication so obviously fitted to debase it, and to counteract its salutary influence, or rather effectually to close the ear against it.

But in reply to such observations as these, it is stated that it is the privilege of every man who feels himself qualified, to preach the Gospel whenever he has opportunity; or to exhort his brethren whenever he feels inwardly prompted to assume this important function. As this is an interesting topic, frequently discussed in conversation, I shall briefly examine it, and enquire how far the advocates of this species of exhortation are borne out in their assertions by the Word of God.

According to an eminent writer on English synonyms, the word "exhort" is equivalent to "persuade." It is compounded of *ex* and *hortor*, from the Greek *ωρται* perfect passive of *ωραω* to excite or impel. "Exhortation has more of impelling in it; persuasion more of drawing. A superior exhorts; his words carry authority with them, and rouse to action." Such is the current force of the word in the English language. The Greek word *παρακαλεω*, relied on chiefly in this controversy, and usually rendered "exhort," is thus explained by Parkurst:

"1. To send for, call to ones self. 2. To beg, intreat, beseech. 3. To exhort, admonish. 4. To console, comfort, properly, in words. 5. To comfort in whatever manner. Hence, *παρακαλαις* means, 1. Intreaty, importunity. 2. Admonition, exhortation. 3. Consolation comfort."

Thus we never find the word *exhortation* employed to signify a sermon, or an address in public; neither does exhort ever mean to address a meeting; and more than this, the word *exhorter* does not occur once in the whole Bible. The corresponding Greek word is applied to Christ (1 John, ii. 1,) and to the Holy Ghost, (John xiv. 16; xv. 26; xvi. 7.) These are all the places in which it occurs in the New Testament. It is never applied to any office-bearer in the Church. Now I think it is exceedingly manifest that if *exhortation* were the appropriate designation of any public function, whether occasional or permanent, the person employed to discharge that function would be known by the concrete term *exhorter*. Thus we have apostles, ambassadors, evangelists, preachers, pastors, bishops, deacons; all names derived from the nature of the office sustained, or the work performed; but the *exhorter* is never once mentioned. Now why is this omission? Evidently because there was no peculiar work or office known to the apostles by the term exhortation.

Now I must unfeignedly say, that it appears to me very strange that Christian men, who profess to regard the Bible as the standard of faith and practice, should endeavour to demolish offices clearly established by the head of the Church, and labour to create one, of which there is not a word in the Records of Inspiration! But such, alas, are some of the melancholy vagaries of the human mind. Between a proud, indolent, worldly ministry on the one hand, and an ignorant, perverse, revolutionary fanaticism on the other, the Church has often been reduced to the condition of the living child for which the two

women contended before Solomon. There has seemed no way of deciding the contest but the cruel and unnatural one of "dividing" with the sword of strife the spouse of Christ, which is the "mother of us all"—an alternative which the innovators alluded to have ever been too ready to adopt. But to return.

The truth is, that exhortation, so far as I have been able to gather from the Bible, belongs to no office at all, is not necessarily connected with the "use of gifts," nor does it imply any public exhibition. It is a duty incumbent on believers *universally*, but especially incumbent on persons in *authority*, as parents, masters, magistrates, and *peculiarly* on ministers of the Gospel. "Exhort one another daily," is a precept co-extensive in its obligation with such as "Bear one another's burdens," "Help one another's infirmities," "Love one another," &c. The Church is an army enlisted under the banner of the Cross, and led on by Christ, the Captain of our Salvation, who has appointed subordinate officers to guide, command, and exhort his people; to—

"Reprove each dull delay,

Allure to brighter worlds and lead the way."

Feeble and faithless as are the people of God in themselves, they need to be cheered and exhorted continually, lest they be weary and faint in their minds. But it is well known that the most animating sounds that reach the ears of the soldier in the hour of battle, are those which proceed from his faithful and affectionate comrades that fight by his side. It is the mutual shout of generous emulation which renders them insensible of danger, which prompts to deeds of heroism, and bears them on to victory. Every man, in his proper station, contributes his share to the general effect. Every faithful soldier exhorts his neighbour, and the superior officers rejoice in such exhibitions of courage and fidelity. But should some of the private soldiers turn out of the ranks, and insist on making speeches to the rest on the art of war, and the conduct that became them at the existing crisis; and should they contend that officers were quite unnecessary; that each man had a right to give orders to his fellows, and to instruct them in their duty, especially if he fancied himself a good speaker—should such a spirit as this manifest itself in the army, what would be the result? The answer will easily suggest itself to every reader.

This is a fair representation of the nature and tendency of the principles advocated by those persons who are incessantly harping on the word exhortation. They would either speedily dissolve any Christian Church, or render it not worth keeping together.

Exhortation does not require any set form of speech. We may exhort in a long address, (Luke iii. 18; Acts ii. 40; xv. 32; xx. 2;) or in a letter, (Acts xv. 31,) or by the utterance of

a single phrase, (Acts xxvii. 22;) or, as superiors, by the expression of a desire, (2 Cor. viii. 6. 17;) or, which is perhaps the most effectual way of all, and certainly that with which private Christians have the most concern, we may exhort one another by our conduct and example in society. Thus the Apostle writes to the Thessalonians, (1 Thessa. v. 11,) "Exhort yourselves together, and edify one another, as also ye do."

Mr. Hunter, to whose book I directed the attention of your readers in the last Number of the EXAMINER, contends that the word "together" implies that they were to discharge the duty when assembled in a place of worship. I fancy such an assembly would be far from edifying. We may easily know from experience, that there is very little profit to be had where the attention is distracted by a number of persons, all speaking together. The strongest lungs would gain the victory. Unhappily, however, for his theory, the word together has no corresponding term in the original. According to lexicographers, *αλλήλων* signifies "one another, each other, mutually or reciprocally." The same writer tells us, in a note at the foot of his first page, that he means exhortation to be "*mutual* only so far as gifts are possessed." Here, I think, there is an unwarrantable assumption, and an unqualified absurdity. He assumes that it is not the duty of any but *gifted* persons, as he calls them, to exhort one another—a limitation of the duty for which there is no warrant in Scripture. And there is also, in his language, the implied absurdity, that none but the *teachers* are to be taught. This explanatory note, on the *title* of Mr. Hunter's book, resembles some of those appended to the Rhemish Bible, which only tend to obscure the text.

Indeed if none but really gifted individuals undertook the work of exhortation, we would have reason to feel very thankful. Many a busy, carping tongue would then be silent; many a waspish censor would cease to pester the Church.

You sometimes meet with persons who have laboured hard to get a *name* for sanctity, (they have their reward,) and their spiritual appetite is so depraved that they seem to delight in nothing but *faults*. If they have nothing to *complain* of and to censure, they are peevish and sick. But if something humiliating, or disgraceful, or unhappy occurs within their sphere, joy at once sparkles in the eye and illuminates the countenance, while they hurry off with their exhortation, or their commiseration, or their donation, as the case may be. If you happen to drop an expression not in accordance with the conventional cant of the little religious coterie to which they belong, you are at once unceremoniously interrupted, and thereby hangs a—sermon. Are there not persons whose conversation is an incessant boast, couched under the language of humiliation; who unconsciously rejoice in evil, that they may thence enjoy the praise of doing good; whose faithfulness is but a mask for malevolence; whose zeal is but a cloak for insatiable ambition; and who quote "the

Glory of God," to sanctify passions in which no Christian ought to indulge?

Religion, at the present day, opens a theatre for display and notoriety to many an aspiring individual, male and female, whose peculiar circumstances would otherwise doom them to obscurity and utter oblivion.

I sincerely hope that the Churches of God in Ireland have too much good sense, and sound Scriptural knowledge, to be imposed upon by religious empirics, whose zeal is extravagance, and whose piety is pharasaic singularity. The false prophets of old wore "*rough garments to deceive*." I fear, Mr. Editor, there are some of the representatives of that fraternity still living! Oh, that we had an enlightened—a Scripturally-enlightened public opinion in Ireland! Those libels on the religion of Jesus would then speedily be rebuked from the Church.

But these illustrations, which are, however, not inapposite to the question in hand, have diverted me somewhat too far from the direct line of argumentation—to which I shall now return.

Who that looks at the Bible, with a single eye does not perceive that "exhort one another," and "confess your faults one to another," are phrases that inculcate duties of similar extent and equal force of obligation? Are they not equally binding on every Christian, high and low, enlightened and ignorant? If I offend my brother, should I not confess my fault? And if I see him feeble-minded, wavering, walking inconsistently, or betraying an unchristian spirit, is it not my duty to comfort him, lest he faint, or to exhort and warn him *privately* with all meekness and love, lest he be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin? There is nothing that can be said of the *manner* of discharging one duty, that may not, with equal propriety, be said of the manner of doing the other.

Sir, I am anxious to rescue this most important Christian duty from the misrepresentations of those well-meaning but weak-minded system-makers who would pervert and corrupt it. Exhortation is, as I have already stated, the duty of all Christians, when circumstances call for its exercise; but chiefly of those placed in stations of authority, and peculiarly of persons sustaining the ministerial office. For, according to Crabbe, whose words I have already quoted, "*a superior exhorts: his words carry authority and rouse to action*." Hence we find that the persons mentioned in Scripture, as delivering hortatory addresses, are not mere private members of the Church, previously unauthorised, and claiming a right to speak in the congregation in virtue of the gifts they possessed, but men invested with official authority, and that generally of the highest order.

Thus our Lord, as the great Prophet of the Church, *exhorting* (*παράκλησεν*) preached to the people in the synagogue, (Luke iii. 18.) Thus Peter, the Ambassador of God, appointed to open fully the dispensation of mercy to the world, exhorted on the

day of Pentecost, (Acts ii. 40.) Thus the Apostles at Jerusalem exhorted the Christians at Antioch, (Acts xv. 31.) Thus the great Apostle of the Gentiles exhorts frequently throughout his epistles; and thus Timothy and Titus, men acting as the deputies of the Apostles, exhorted and rebuked *with all authority*. (Tit. i. 9; ii. 15; 2 Tim. iv. 2, &c.)

It is urged that the fact of our Lord and the Apostles speaking in the Jewish synagogues, proves that among the Jews the custom existed of permitting strangers and private persons to exhort in their worshipping assemblies, and that in this, Christian Churches are bound to imitate them. To this I reply, that were we to admit the conclusions drawn from the facts referred to, Christian Churches are not bound to conform to the customs of Jewish synagogues; and though the practice contended for did exist among the Hebrews, it does not thence follow that it ought to exist among us. But I deny, altogether, the premises from which this obligation is inferred.

There were in each synagogue, according to Dr. Lightfoot, three rulers, who regulated all its concerns, and one of whom, called the "angel of the synagogue," preached to the people;—unless some individual were present, distinguished for his knowledge of the Sacred Writings, or regarded by the people as a prophet: such a person the *Archisynagogos* might authorise to address the people. Now, that the Jews viewed our Lord and his Apostles as eminent prophets and teachers, and revered them as such, until their prejudices were awakened and their animosity was kindled against them, admits not of a doubt. From the practice of the synagogue, therefore, admitting that we were bound to conform to it, we can derive no warrant for *soi-disant* gifted members of a Church rising up when they please to address the people in speeches, short or long.

But we are referred, confidently, to Rom. xii. 8., where it is said, "He that exhorteth, let him wait on exhortation." I do not think that any person who understands this passage would adduce it as a proof of a variety of offices in the Church. If we make out of it a prophet, a minister, a teacher, an exhorter, or a ruling elder, on what principle of interpretation do we reject, as non-official characters, "him that gives, and him that shows mercy?" They are manifestly placed in the same category, and if you predicate office in regard to one of them, you must do so in regard to each and all. How strangely do systems blind the eyes of readers of the Bible!

The meaning of the Apostle seems simply to be, that whatever be our talents, or means of doing good, we should employ them to the utmost in the service of God. It is an adaptation to specific circumstances of the words of the wise man, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." (Eccl. ix. 10.) We may thus paraphrase the passage: Let him who has received the word of "wisdom" or of "knowledge" from the Spirit, be earnest in inculcating it on the Church. Let him

who has been appointed to "minister" to the poor, &c. (See Scott in loc.) whether as deacon, or in any other sense the Church's deputy, attend to the business in hand with prudence, discrimination, and promptitude. Let him who is engaged in "teaching" young persons, or recent converts, be intent on his own employment, without meddling with that of others. Let him to whom has been committed the more important charge of "exhorting," of arousing the minds and stimulating the energies of the people, be prepared, by the cogency of his arguments, by the pathos and power of his appeals to the heart, to convince gainsayers, and to solace and animate the people of God. Let him who has it in his power to relieve the necessities of his brethren, do it liberally and unostentatiously. Let him who occupies a station of authority, be attentive to its duties, and alive to its responsibility; and let him whose province it happens to be to attend more immediately to the wants of the children of wretchedness, do it cheerfully, however loathsome the scenes he is called on to witness.

Thus, I think, these directions are general, and are no more intended to indicate offices in the Church than those which follow in the remainder of the chapter. Equally unavailing will be found the appeal which our opponents so frequently make to 1 Cor. xii. & xiv. chapters. In regard to the Corinthian Church, it must be borne in mind, that the state of things among them was extraordinary, and many of the gifts conferred on them, supernatural. When our young and ardent friends, who are so confident in their own inspiration, and so prone to despise their venerable seniors, men of mature wisdom and extensive usefulness, whose praise is in all the Churches; when these young men, so reckless in their zeal, and so impetuous in their movements, show themselves able, like many of the Corinthians, to work miracles, to heal diseases, to discern spirits, and to speak in languages they never learned, then we shall acknowledge their claims, and permit them to break through the order of our worshipping assemblies. Were there any Churches now in existence at all resembling that at Corinth, in its condition and in the nature of its gifts, it would be logical and just to reason from one to the other. But when, in this respect, there is such a manifest disparity in the circumstances of the primitive and modern churches, to denounce the latter for their want of conformity, is very unmeaning declamation.

Whether miraculous gifts may be expected by the Church at the present day, and whether those who boast of them have made good their claim, are questions which it is not my object at present to discuss. I may just say, in passing, that in regard to both, I unhesitatingly take up the negative position.

The Apostle makes a particular enumeration of gifts in his Epistle to the Corinthians, (1 Cor. xii. 7—10; 28—30;) and it is remarkable that he is silent as to the *Exhorter*. The simple reason is, that exhortation, instead of being a *special kind* of

address, peculiarly appropriated to a certain officer as his distinctive avocation, constituted a feature, more or less prominent, of all the discourses of the primitive preachers, according as the circumstances of their hearers demanded warning, admonition, or consolation. What is the New Testament, especially the epistolary part of it, but a series of exhortations? Its warnings and admonitions administer "reproof" and "correction," while its exceeding great and precious promises pour abundant consolation into the mourner's heart, and fill the soul with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

It is equally fatal to the claims of the *Exhorter*, that he is wholly unnoticed by the Apostle in Eph. iv. 11, where he enumerates the offices conferred by Christ for the edification of his body, the Church. We have there apostles, prophets, evangelists, and pastors, and teachers—but *no exhorter*! Comment on these facts is quite needless. The reader will see at once that this office is entirely apocryphal; that it has not even the semblance of a warrant from Scripture; and he will, doubtless, lament the almost unaccountable fatuity which blinds the eyes of some individuals to evidence so palpable and so conclusive.

The only other passages at all relevant to the subject are in Heb. iii. 13; x. 25, "Exhort one another daily, lest any be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin." Now let us just ask ourselves, were the scattered Hebrews hereby enjoined to meet *daily* in a place of worship, for reading the Bible and haranguing one another *publicly* on the subject of their *individual* backslidings?

Again, "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together, but exhorting one another." From these words it is inferred, that the mutual exhortation takes place in a public assembly. To me, however, it appears manifest that the words here used are not intended to point out the *place* where the exhortation was to be given, but the *fault* against which it was to be directed. This was the neglect of public worship—an alarming indication of perverted principles, or declining piety. It also appears clear to me that admonition would be given privately from house to house. This kind of mutual exhortation is our duty, and is most profitable, so long as it is conducted in a right spirit; for it is exceedingly liable to abuse, owing to the pride of the human heart.

Meetings for searching the Scriptures, and conversing on religious subjects, I believe to be most important, and that no Christian congregation should be without them; indeed that they should be held as frequently as possible. But I am persuaded they should not *supercede* the *preaching* of the Gospel, and the solemn and public worship of God on the *Sabbath*. Neither do these Bible classes meet for exhortation, except so far as it may occur in the Word of God. They meet, like the Bereans, to search the Records of Inspiration; and I am sure they would deem it a fanatical interruption of their proceedings,

were some of their number to arise and harangue them on their individual faults. There is a *time* for every thing.

Let it not be supposed, therefore, that in opposing what is mis-called exhortation, we are trying to extinguish a spirit of inquiry. Would that there were more of this spirit abroad! May the Holy Ghost awaken, increase, and direct it, until all shall know the Redeemer, from the least to the greatest!

J. G.

ON THE CHILDREN OF RELIGIOUS PARENTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—That the children of religious parents often try the patience and disappoint the hopes of those most interested in their welfare, is a matter of common observation. It is true; indeed, upon a general comparison of these with the children of the irreligious, that the balance of good is abundantly in favour of the former. It is true, also, that in many instances the early seed, long in appearance dead, revives in after years, and yields a large increase; and that many a prodigal, in want and misery, arises, at the remembrance of happier days, and returns to his father's house. But still, with all these allowances, it must be granted that the children of religious parents too often fail to answer the expectations which we might naturally form respecting them. It may therefore be useful to trace, as far as we are able, the causes to which effects so much to be deplored are owing. Before I enter into this investigation, I would, however, premise two things. 1. That no education, however favoured by circumstances, though planned by the soundest wisdom, and conducted with the utmost diligence, and though seconded by the bright example and ceaseless prayers of the best of parents, can communicate the living spark of true religion. "A man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven." Whatever, therefore, I may suggest respecting the instrumental advantages or disadvantages of any class of children, I do so under the fullest conviction that the free and sovereign grace of God alone can save their souls. 2. It is not my design, in the following observations, to take into account those instances of culpable mismanagement or neglect with which too many, even pious parents, may at times be chargeable. I shall confine myself to such hindrances as seem, in the very nature of the case, to be opposed to parents of this description in the training of their children.

That such impediments do exist, is my firm belief. I mean thereby, disadvantages peculiar to the children of religious parents, and such as the children of worldly parents are not exposed to, and which serve consequently as some counterbalance to the many

superior advantages which the former so unquestionably possess. Such being, as I conceive, the fact, I have a two-fold object in calling attention to it. First of all, that pious parents may be put upon their guard, and be enabled thereby to meet and counteract, as far as possible, the real difficulties of their situation; and, in the next place, that such parents may not add to their other trials that of imputing solely to their own misconduct, failures which proceeded from far different causes.

The first of the disadvantages to which I shall allude, is the following: One of the strongest and earliest tendencies of human nature is the love of independence—of choosing for ourselves, and being masters of our own actions. A principle of obedience, or the still better principle of love, may lead a child to take the path in which he is ordered to go; but in no path will he run with such alacrity as that which he is allowed to strike out for himself. No one can be at all acquainted with children without perceiving how they cherish and prize whatever they can call their own—how all their father's possessions, which they can freely use, are valued less than the trifle which can boast the single charm of being their's exclusively. The same anxiety extends throughout. The child instinctively desires to be master of what he is and does, as well as what he has. He wishes to be an individual, and not a mere appendage—to live for himself, to think for himself, to come out from under the shade of another, and to see with his own eyes in the broad and common daylight. This propensity will manifest itself in a thousand ways. Stretch out your hand to a child, and challenge him, with two or three other persons, to guess how many pins or pebbles you hold in it, and he will uniformly avoid pitching on any number which has been named before. And why? Because, if he guesses rightly, the great pleasure will be to think that the guess will be exclusively his own.

Such is our native thirst for independence—a principle full of danger, because our nature is full of danger, but in all probability inseparable from our moral being, and indispensably necessary to our own elevation above mere machines. However this may be, there decidedly is no small impediment opposed by this tendency to the efforts of the religious parent. The love of liberty is against him; the powerful attraction of that principle is constantly opposed to him; the strong desire of independence is instinctively working to defeat his schemes. The ways of evil have to his child all the sweetness of forbidden fruit. In these there can be no jealousy of control, no suspicion of undue influence. In every evil course, the desire of liberty and independence is gratified; and whatever wrong step a young person, so circumstanced, may take, he feels, at least, in taking it, that he is acting for himself, and following his own free choice. On the other hand, in all those paths which lead to goodness and to God, the parent's footsteps are before the child; and while moving in that direction, he knows that all has been anticipated by the plans, and forestalled by the wishes of another. Much, in this respect, must

depend upon the constitutional temperament, and much upon the peculiar circumstances of the individual. But still, on the whole, this must be admitted as a disadvantage to which the rising families of the religious are necessarily subject; while the children of the irreligious have in their favour the opposite advantage; for it is clear that, in their case, to choose religiously is to choose altogether for themselves. The natural dislike to trammels and dictation is all on the side of separation from the world, with them. Nor could the most wayward youth originate a bolder scheme, or make a stouter declaration of independence, than to tell a worldly parent that henceforth he would serve the Lord.

The disadvantage of which I speak would be far less than it really is, if religious parents had no responsibilities but what they owe their children; for, in this case, things might be so managed as greatly to counteract the evil. Nothing, it will be allowed, can be less desirable than to present religion to any mind in stronger characters than are suitable to its strength; than, as the apostle terms it, to offer strong meat to babes. The youthful mind especially should have line upon line, and precept upon precept. Every pains should be taken to prevent the appetite from being overloaded, or strictnesses imposed, which revolt the taste, or alienate the affections from what must be affectionately embraced, to be embraced at all. But, in this respect, parents often want a free field of action. They have duties to perform to others as well as to their children; they have to uphold the principles of religion to the world; they have servants to rule in the fear of God; they are accountable to society for what passes in their families. All these oblige them, more or less, to establish in their houses a system by no means calculated to conciliate those who want the only principle which can render frequent religious exercises, repeated conversations about religion, and the exclusion of all worldly amusements, any thing but a burden and restraint. Surely no judicious man, who wished to win a careless heart to God, would voluntarily force upon its possessor a reluctant compliance with such strict observances. But how is a religious parent to avoid what virtually amounts to this, if his children are yet uninfluenced and unimpressed? Can he sanction their absence from family devotions, to the injury of servants and of younger children? Can he be silent about religion before his friends, or can he silence them, because his children happen to be present? Or can he adopt, for their sakes, compliances with worldly habits, which the Scriptures and his own conscience condemn? No. Yet, doubtless, to the young person who has not made religion his own choice, these necessary strictnesses of a parent's house are badly calculated to win him over. Were he transplanted to another scene; had he the opportunity of hearing occasionally the conversation of some pious acquaintance; and had he the liberty of receiving or rejecting his counsels just in proportion as they were acceptable or not, without being pressed into the

service of religion, before his own inclinations led him, he would be far better situated, as it respects his religious prospects. Here then is an instance in which the children of worldly parents may have an advantage over the children of religious ones.

2. The next particular which I shall notice, is this—In the education of children, much must be carried on, by religious and irreligious parents, which is common to the plans of both. Many restraints are to be imposed; manners are to be formed; a thousand interferences are necessary to correct the strange and awkward habits into which children would, without such constant vigilance, be sure to fall. In working this detail, there must be a frequent recurrence to some principles which may animate the child, and supply him with motives to self-improvement. With these the worldly parent is readily supplied. The desire of excelling others, anxiety about appearance, the thirst for admiration, and, above all, the important moment when those of the higher classes are to be brought out, for the first time, into the world; these are constantly appealed to; and often is this done with a harshness and ceaseless repetition not a little calculated to disgust the youthful mind with things so imperious in their demands, and which require such constant sacrifices of present ease and comfort. But the religious parent cannot apply these stimulants. She (for to the mother chiefly this lesser discipline belongs) cannot treat, as all-important to her child, what she herself esteems as worse than valueless. Her conviction, doubtless, is, that religion should extend itself to every thing; and that no trifling action can want a motive which it does not supply. Religion, then, whether expressed or implied, must be the instrument by which she works. If indeed her child be early inclined to piety, all will be well. But, if not, every aversion to restraint will be visited on the principle that imposes it. A prudent mother, to avoid such consequences, may make but few direct appeals to this all-regulating motive. But what can she substitute? It must be mere authority; and this will scarcely mend the matter; for it will only turn the aversion from religion itself to her who is the providential channel of its conveyance to the child.

3. It is, moreover, to be lamented that the faults and infirmities of religious parents act with peculiar disadvantage upon the minds of children. I speak of such defects as by no means invalidate their claims to that character, but which are, more or less, inseparable from human nature. It would, indeed, be a contradiction in terms to suppose religious parents to sin with a high hand, like those who know not God; but the truth is, that their spots and blemishes, when contrasted with the high standard of their principles, will be magnified by the light in which they are seen; while the sins of those whose chief condemnation it is to exclude the light, will often escape observation in the darkness that surrounds them. However this may be, the children of both the religious and irreligious will see defects in their parents, and sometimes feel those defects as trying and irritating to them-

selves. But the misfortune is, that the children of the former may be tempted to impute the faults of their parents to the score of their religion, than which nothing can be more likely to foster unfavourable prejudices in the mind. Nor will such an imputation be always groundless. Those who are truly sincere, but not highly advanced in religion, are subject to trials peculiar to themselves. In such persons there is, not unfrequently, a morbid scrupulousness of conscience, an inward conflict of opposing principles, and a keen sensibility to the faults of others, particularly of those for whom they are chiefly interested, which produce irritability, dejection, and discomfort. That these defects may remain long after the mind has been substantially changed, is my firm belief. They are like bodily distempers which affect no vital organ, and which a sound constitution throws out upon the surface. Nevertheless, spots and blemishes they are; and from the very circumstance of their being upon the surface, they often more immediately affect the comfort of others, than do those sins which lie deep and are concealed. It is true that, if rightly understood, these imperfections would be traced, not to religion, but to the want of its higher influences. But children cannot make these nice distinctions; nor is an irritated mind disposed to make them; nor, indeed, would it perhaps be well for children thus to sit in judgment on their parents. No. The fact is, that if religion be the ruling principle of the parent's life and actions, the child will know and feel it; he will identify the parent with religion; and whatever appears unamiable and unconciliating in the one, will tend to render the other less valued and less loved.

On the other hand, those faults and sins of irreligious parents which try the tempers, and disturb the comfort of their children, have rather the opposite tendency of rendering impiety odious, and religion amiable. No young persons, however unhappily circumstanced, can be wholly ignorant that there is such a thing as religion. If, indeed, they had no other means of knowing, the reproaches of those who hate it would inform them of its existence. It is then but human nature, that if such children know, and are frequently reminded, that their parents' principles are at variance with religion, and if they are made to taste the fruits of bitterness which these principles produce, they will so far be disposed to hate the causes of their own discomfort, and rally in affection to that which they have been taught to consider as diametrically opposed to them.

H. W.

(To be continued.)

PROPOSALS FOR CHURCH REFORM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—Will you kindly allow me, through the pages of your Miscellany, to submit to my clerical brethren of the Established Church in Ireland, a subject which appears to demand their serious and prompt consideration. It is as to the propriety of their meeting in their respective dioceses, and drawing up a petition to his Majesty, humbly praying that he, as head of the Church, would be graciously pleased to appoint a commission of clergymen, and if expedient, of laymen of known attachment to the Church, to enquire if any, or what abuses have crept into that communion, how they may best be corrected, and by what means their future occurrence may be most effectually guarded against, and the affairs of the Church best regulated for the time to come. Such commission to have the power of examining the clergy and laity of the Established Church on these subjects.

The plan now proposed seems to me perfectly legitimate, and appears to be called for by the following circumstances:—

1st. The Bill which lately received the Royal assent, purported to refer solely to the temporalities of the Church, leaving the spiritualities just as they were, but in these, likewise, it is alleged that reformation is also necessary.

Should not the truth of this allegation be enquired into, and if found correct, the degree also to which reformation may be necessary?

2d. The laity, as a body, do not appear to be cordially united with the clergy of our Church. There are very many, no doubt, of the lay-members of the Church affectionately attached to their clergy; but I fear, the laity at large are not decidedly with us. This I infer from the fact, that during the agitation of the late measures, by which ten of our bishops were cut off at one stroke, but one meeting of laymen was held in all Ireland to advocate the cause of the Church. I allude to the meeting in Cork.

Should not then the clergy come forward, and shew that they are not averse to any necessary reformation, and thus endeavour to carry with them, at least, the laity of their own communion?

3d. If the clergy do not take a part in the business of reforming the Church, it will be done for them—done without them—and done, perhaps, to excess. A thirst for reform in all things is the order of the day; it may as yet be directed and regulated, but cannot be entirely suppressed; and I fear, if suffered to operate undirected on the Church, it will produce ruin instead of salutary emendation.

4th. It is not enough that whatever abuses are now to be found in the Church should be corrected; it is necessary also, that a power should be vested somewhere in that body, to pre-

vent the recurrence of similar abuses, and to direct the future movements of the great machine.

The former regulating power of the Church is now manifestly unsuitable to the task. Members of the Church of Rome, which has always been hostile to every thing Protestant, now sit in both houses of parliament; and Protestant dissenters, of every denomination, can at present have seats in the lower house; and I know of nothing to prevent his Majesty calling them to the upper.

The king, as head of the Church and State, is the only power left unimpaired to us in the constitution.

Unless, then, the Established Church is to be in part regulated by those who may be its enemies, or by those who conscientiously separate from its communion, it must be invested with a similar power of self-regulation to that which is possessed even by the least numerous and most obscure religious body in the kingdom.

Hoping, Sir, that these few remarks may not be without effect on the minds of my clerical brethren,

I remain, Sir,

Yours respectfully,

B. W. M.

**R. D. IN ANSWER TO THE REV. THOMAS KELLY'S
REPLY TO THE REV. WILLIAM BURGH.**

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

DEAR SIR—It is surely one important branch of the work of your Magazine to examine and review the publications of the day which are connected with our common Christianity. As then you have not as yet, I believe, made any remarks upon "A Letter to the Rev. William Burgh, by the Rev. Thomas Kelly," will you permit me to do so through the medium of your very useful publication.

I ever read with interest whatever comes from the pen of Mr. Kelly. I love him, I value him, I esteem him; my personal feelings towards him at first led me to the conclusion that I could not animadvert upon any thing that he wrote; but when I more maturely considered the question, I felt I could enter into an examination of his sentiments with less danger of evil, and more hope of good, than I could enter into controversy with almost any other person. It would be almost impossible that there could be any thing of unpleasant or irritated feelings between us. I have loved him, with all the difference of opinion, on Church matters, that existed between us. I have experienced that kindness and confidence which has assured me that I have had a

share in his affection and regard. I am more sure of his candour and simple love of truth, than I am of mine own; so that, were I to impute to him any unworthy motive in any thing he did or said, I should deserve to have the worst imputed to myself. With whom, then, could I argue upon points of Christian truth, with so little danger of evil, and so much hope of good—with so little ground to fear doing an injury to my own spirit, or inflicting a wound on his. I have determined, therefore, with your permission, to canvass some very important principles laid down in his letter, through the medium of your Magazine.

I do not intend to take out of Mr. Burgh's hands the controversy, originally between Mr. Kelly and him, as to tradition. I leave that where I found it. I mean to address myself to those positions with regard to the constitution and nature of a church, which, however extraneous to the subject handled by Mr. Burgh, Mr. Kelly took the opportunity of his letter to introduce. I would select a few important points of difference between the nature and constitution of a church in Mr. Kelly's view and in mine.

I would begin with his definition of a church, in which, I think, can be found the very essence and germ of all that I consider erroneous in his system of church government.

He says, p. 35, "The term church, in the apostolic writings (I am not aware of any exception,) denoted a number of individuals, who either did or might assemble in the same place." I beg leave to dissent from this definition of a church. It is certainly unscriptural. I am sure there is nothing said in Scripture to confine a church to the numbers of individuals that either did or might assemble in one place. According to Mr. Kelly, this is an essential point in the notion of a church; and yet I would appeal to him, if it is ever so mentioned in Scripture. On the contrary, I think there are many things said that would lead one to conclude, that where a church is spoken of, there is often meant a number of individuals that neither did nor might assemble in one place. I would take, as an example, the church at Jerusalem. It is said of it, Acts, iv. 4, "The number of the *men* was about 5,000." Now, I would say, that in the absence of any declaration on the subject in the Scripture, that hypothesis stands upon a very improbable foundation which takes for granted that these 5,000 men did or might assemble in one place; and then, these are but the *men* (*andres*) distinctly spoken of as opposed to the women (*vide* Scott in loc.); so that the number of adults might be considered as 10,000. And we further read, chap. v. 14, "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women." Multitudes added to the 10,000! And so, in Acts, xxi. 20, we read James and the elders of Jerusalem saying to Paul, "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe" (*ποσαι μυριαδες*); which might be translated, "how many tens of thousands." Now, I would ask, is there any ground for

saying, that these myriads, these tens of thousands did or might assemble for worship in one place. It appears evident to me that the number of believers in Jerusalem was too large for them to assemble for worship in one place, to be acquainted with one another, and to watch over each other; and yet they are called a church, in the singular number, Acts, viii. 4, xv. 4, 22, &c.

I should think there was reason to suppose that the church at Ephesus was too large to meet for worship in one place. Paul, from Miletus, sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church; he says to them, chap. xxi. 25, "And now behold I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more," (*ἐν οἷς διηλθὼν χηρυσσῶν*, &c.) This conveys rather to my mind the idea that he was addressing the elders of various congregations, in and about Ephesus, whom he had *gone through* (*διηλθὼν*) in preaching the word.

There are some places in which the word church (*ἐκκλησία*) is used, in which, at first sight, at least, it does not seem capable of signifying such a congregation as did or might assemble in one place. This apparent inconsistency with Mr. Kelly's theory, he endeavours to get rid of, as to some texts, whilst there are others which he does not notice. I shall quote his own words. "There is, indeed, a sense in which the word church is used in the New Testament, which does not include the idea of a present congregation. I mean when the term is applied to the whole body of God's elect; but there is a reference to that day in which all the individuals composing the body shall be literally assembled together, and be exhibited in their collective capacity, 'the general assembly and church of the first born.' This use of the word, then, constitutes no explanation. The term would not be applied to the whole body of believers, except they were to be assembled in one mass. Matters are in preparation for that day when the Lord shall come 'to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe.' And it is *then* that he will present it as a whole to himself, a glorious church (*ἐκκλησία*, assembly,) 'not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing,' Eph. 5; and at the same time, will be known by the church (assembly) the 'manifold wisdom of God.'"

I shall say nothing upon the two texts first quoted by Mr. Kelly in this extract. I protest against his interpretation and way of quoting the last, Eph. iii. 10, the whole of which I beg leave to quote: "To the intent that *now* unto principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God." I agree with Mr. Kelly, that it will be *then*, when Jesus shall come to be glorified in his saints, that he shall present unto himself a glorious church without spot, &c.; but I protest against his saying that it will be *then*, at the same time, that there shall be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God. Mr. Kelly says *then*—the text says *now*. Mr. Kelly quotes the words partially, as if the wisdom of God was to be known by the church; whereas the text says, that the wisdom of

God shall be known by principalities and powers, or made known (*γνωρισθῇ*) to principalities and powers, by means of the church *now*. In this view of the text, the church does not signify God's elect, as they shall be gathered into one place partaking of glory, but as they are scattered throughout the world, and called out of the world, and the subject of God's gracious and wise dealing *now*. There are many places in which the word means not a particular congregation, but the whole body of God's people, scattered as they are throughout the world. Mat. xvi. 18, "And upon this rock I will build my church." Eph. i. 22, "Gave him to be head over all things to the church." Eph. v. 23, 24, 25, "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church, and he is the Saviour of the body." "Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ," &c. "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it." Verse 29, "But nourisheth and cherisheth it even as the Lord the church." Rom. xvi. 23, "Gaius mine host, and of the whole church." Surely, in this last text, Paul means to say that Gaius was hospitable to him, and to every member of the church of Christ that came from distant parts to Corinth—not to them who were in the habit of joining him in worship at Corinth, who would not want his hospitality, but to those strangers, believing in Jesus, belonging to that body of which he was head, who might accidentally come to Corinth.

As my valued friend, Mr. Kelly, appears to me to give a definition of the word church, in which he will not be borne out by the use of the word in Scripture, so, I think, he ascribes offices and duties to a church, such as are not ascribed to it in Scripture. He says, p. 40, "*The church receives believers who offer themselves.*" Now, if this is not *anti-scriptural*, I cannot but think it is perfectly *unscriptural*. It is one of the duties of a church (if it be a duty,) for which, as far as I know the Scriptures, they give neither precept or example; and yet it is a fundamental principle in such a church as Mr. Kelly advocates. It is very remarkable that Mr. Kelly never attempts to give any scriptural proof of this essential duty of a church. He says, "This is involved in the very nature of the thing, the church being constituted for the edification of the body in love, and this object being unattainable, unless the children be admitted; but of this I have spoken before at some length." Here there is no Scriptural proof alleged, and I have looked back, and still can find none. Indeed, as far as I know the Scriptures, there is not to be found an example of a church, that is, the individual members composing a congregation, sitting in judgment as to receiving or rejecting an individual who was desirous of worshipping Christ with them. Whereas I can bring several instances of individuals received into the church of Christ, without being subjected to the judgment of the individuals of a congregation. I would ask, when Peter preached on the day of Pentecost, is it not written, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." Were they not joined to the church by baptism? Is there a word about the

lay members of the Church sitting in judgment on each of them, to decide whether they should be received? Scripture is silent about any such proceeding. From whence does my valued friend, Mr. Kelly, supply the defect? Again, when Philip, chap. viii., baptized the Ethiopian eunuch, did he not become a member of the church by baptism? Was there any congregation that sat in judgment as to receiving him or not? Let us look, in the 9th chapter, at the case of Saul. We find Ananias receiving him, and baptizing him. We read of no Church sitting in judgment on him; yet we read, "Then was Saul certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus." We read, indeed, afterwards that "when Saul was come to Jerusalem, he essayed to join himself to the disciples, but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken unto him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus." But this was only the caution that any body of persons would have, with regard to an individual who had been their enemy, and who now professed to be their friend.

Let us look at the baptism of Cornelius, of Lydia, of the jailor of Philippi, these were all received into the Church of Christ, solely upon the responsibility of the minister who preached to them, and who, on their profession of faith, baptized them; there is not one word of a Church sitting in judgment upon them, and formally receiving them. For this essential requisite of such a Church as Mr. Kelly advocates, there does not appear to me to be the slightest warrant in Scripture, either from precept or example. There is a point connected with this, to which Mr. Kelly refers in p. 72, as one of the peculiarities of his Church's constitution, for which, likewise, I cannot find any warrant in Scripture; he calls it "the visible distinction of the Church in worship." I really am at a loss to conceive what portion of Scripture Mr. Kelly would appeal to, as enjoining, either by precept or example, this practice. There was something similar to it in the Jewish Church, of which exclusiveness was a marked feature; but I am certainly ignorant of any one place in the New Testament that could be alleged in support of it.

Having so far considered the want of Scriptural authority for the very principles upon which such a Church as Mr. Kelly speaks of is founded, I proceed to consider how far its acts are performed in accordance with Scripture: and here I must quote some of the words of my valued friend. "We now come to the important part of the duty of a Christian Church, namely, the appointment of office-bearers; without these a Church may exist, and therefore I said nothing about them when I was defining a Church; but without them its organization is not complete. 'For this cause left I thou in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in

every church,' Tit. i. 5. The association called the Church existed, and out of it was to arise elders, who, when they should have discovered their fitness, were to be recognized by the body; *under the superintendence of Titus.* I have marked the last words in italics, to show that I have employed them deliberately, and that I do not wish to shrink from the responsibility attached to the employment of them," p. 41. I have read this paragraph of my dear friend with wonder and astonishment, but I think I never shall be surprised again at any two persons putting an opposite construction upon a passage of Scripture. I have read that 5th verse of Titus with much attention, before I read Mr. Kelly's explanation; I have read it with no little attention since; I can see in it that Paul sent Titus to Crete to set in order the things that he should find wanting; he sent him to exercise his judgment and authority in selecting proper persons to be elders, and ordaining them to the office; Paul himself, having given him, in c. vi. 7, 8 and 9, direction and guidance for his choice of fit persons. I read nothing in this passage calling on the Churches of Crete to discover their fitness, and giving them the right to recognize or reject them. I can find nothing here, said by St. Paul, that conveys the idea that the Churches of Crete had the right, or the spiritual qualifications to judge of the fitness of their teachers. This seems to me to have all been centred in Titus, who was sent to exercise the discretion he possessed, and the authority committed to him. There is much said in the subsequent part of the chapter to show that the Christians of Crete were not qualified to discover the fitness of those who should teach them. "For there are many unruly and vain talkers, and deceivers, specially those of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped; who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow-bellies. This witness is true: wherefore, rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith; not giving heed to Jewish fables and commandments of men, that turn from the truth." When I read the 5th verse, quoted by Mr. Kelly, I find all authority given to Titus, and not a word about authority given to the Churches of Crete; but when I read the verses which I have quoted, I find they were not fit to exercise such an authority. To tell them to choose their teachers would have been to have secured the continuance of error, and of evil of every kind; and I think no one who attentively reads this part of the Epistle to Titus can doubt that the fact was, that Paul did not desire the Churches in Crete to choose elders, under the superintendence of Titus, but desired Titus to choose elders, and to ordain them for the instruction and good ordering of the Churches in Crete. But Mr. Kelly, in another part of his letter, attempting to get rid of ordination entirely, thus writes, p. 6, "Scriptural ordination, I have no doubt, is an important, and in some sense a necessary ordinance.

But what is this? Nothing more, I humbly conceive, *essentially*, than the formal and public recognition of men, as chosen by the assembly (Church) to fill a certain office, and to discharge certain functions."

Afterwards, p. 62, I conceive that the word *ordain*, in Titus i. 5, means no more than mere appointment to office, and that the apostle's directions were simply, "that Titus should see that the thing was done, and done in the usual way." I would appeal to my valued friend, Mr. Kelly, is this treating Scripture with fairness? Is this interpreting its plain language in the way in which any other writing ought to be interpreted. Paul says, "I send thee to ordain." Mr. Kelly says, "that it means that Titus should see that the thing was done, and done in the usual way." Mr. Kelly says in one place, "If I have misinterpreted Scripture it is unintentional." I am perfectly convinced that Mr. K. would not intentionally misinterpret Scripture; I feel more sure that he would not do it, than that I would not do it myself; and yet, I confess I never met with what appears to me a greater instance of misinterpretation. If Paul had wished and intended to state that he had sent Titus to ordain elders himself, he could not have stated it more explicitly; yet Mr. Kelly will give it another meaning; and this, whilst there are so many other places in Scripture that speak of the same thing, the ordaining of elders by laying on of hands, as 1 Tim. iv. 14, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on the hands of the presbytery." 1 Tim. v. 22, "Lay hands suddenly on no man." 2 Tim. i. 6, "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands." And after so many places in Scripture speaking of it, is there no ordination by the laying on of hands in the Church with which Mr. Kelly is connected? Is there no one in the situation of a Titus or a Timothy, to ordain by the laying on of hands? And will Mr. Kelly still maintain the Scriptural character and constitution of his Church? But my valued friend is particularly severe, and even indeed satirical, against Diocesan Episcopacy. He thus writes, p. 47, "Now, my dear Sir, allow me to ask you, what would you do with Diocesan Episcopacy? You find it an important, indeed an essential, part of that system, which you denominate the Church of England. For its institution you must refer to the unwritten word, if such a thing there be. By the written word you cannot sustain it. *Bishops* are indeed found in the written word, but they are the overseers of a community of brethren, meeting in the same place, and are identical with *elders*." Mr. Kelly spends much time and strength upon this part of the subject, as if it was a dispute about words and names, whether the elders generally, or the superintending elder should be most properly called by the name of bishop. There is no doubt that the term bishop, or overseer, is applied in the New Testament to all the elders, and that by degrees the term

has come to be applied to those elders who were in the situation of Timothy and Titus. The controversy is not about the name these officers should be called by, but about the Scriptural warrant for the office itself. Mr. Kelly has himself well defined a Diocesan Bishop, and it is about such an officer as he describes that the controversy lies. Mr. Kelly thus writes, p. 46, "The ecclesiastical officer now called *bishop*, is an individual who has the oversight of many churches." It is a controversy of small importance, whether the elders, or presbyters, should more properly be called *bishops*, *overseers*, and this officer in the church be called by some other name; but it is a controversy of no small importance, whether this overseer of many churches or congregations is an officer for whose office we have the warrant of Scripture. Mr. Kelly, addressing himself to Mr. Burgh, says, p. 44, "You would say of diocesan episcopacy, that it is *unscriptural*, not *anti-Scriptural*." I am sure Mr. Burgh would say no such thing; but leaving Mr. Burgh to answer for himself, I say for myself, that diocesan episcopacy is Scriptural; that a bishop presiding over many congregations is SCRIPTURAL. Mr. Kelly says, p. 89, "The New Testament teaches by precept, by example, and by principles." Now I conceive that there is neither precept, nor example, nor principle for such a Church as Mr. Kelly advocates, but for a diocesan bishop, for an overseer over many congregations, we have an example in Titus overseeing the churches in Crete, "setting in order the things that were wanting, ordaining elders in every city, rebuking sharply those that were unsound in the faith." Crete, with its many elders and churches, and one superintendant, was an example of a diocese, as Titus was an example of a diocesan bishop; and this is the example which Episcopal Churches have endeavoured to follow. We have another example in Timothy overseeing many elders, and as I should suppose, many churches in Ephesus, "charging some to teach no other doctrine;" "behaving himself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, as the pillar and the ground of the truth;" "not rebuking an elder, but entreating him as a father;" "not receiving an accusation against an elder but before two or three witnesses;" "rebuking before all them that sin, that others also may fear;" "laying hands suddenly upon no man." Any officer acting upon this example must be a diocesan bishop.

We have an example of a diocesan bishop, or an individual overseeing many elders and congregations, in the angel of the seven Churches in Asia, to whom the Apostle John was directed to write by him who walked in the midst of the Churches. We have then in the New Testament, an example which Episcopal Churches attempt to follow; and I would put it to the candor of Mr. Kelly, and of your readers, whether a diocese with a bishop presiding, superintending, ordaining—and elders, presbyters, instructing in each congregation, does not more resemble Crete, with its overseer, and elders ordained by him in every city, than

Mr. Kelly's little republic of individuals in a state of equality, without subordination or laying on of hands?

As far as I am capable of forming an opinion, there is nothing so inconsistent with Divine precept or example as Republicanism, either in State or Church; nothing so little suited to the circumstances of fallen man. I look, in vain, for liberty and equality, in any society of God's appointment: a due subordination appears to me to be one of God's appointed means for the regulation and controul of fallen man, in every society, whether civil or ecclesiastical. I am not surprised, then, at Mr. Kelly's most candid and honest confession of the bad working of his system. "The very liberty afforded by our principles, becomes, by abuse," says he, "the source of internal disorder." I feel well assured that it could not be otherwise. The liberty afforded by the principles of Mr. Kelly's Church, is a liberty not afforded by the New Testament—not suited to the corrupt nature of fallen man; most flattering to his pride, but very poison to his soul.

Much more wholesome, but much more unpalatable, is the principle of subordination laid down in such portions of Scripture as the following: "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief." (Heb. xiii. 17.) "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder, (or rather the elders, the presbyters.) Yea, all of you, be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility, for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace unto the humble." (1 Pet. v. 5.) I have occasionally come in contact with persons of the lower ranks, who were, I trust, converted persons, who had been connected with Churches formed upon these republican principles, and I have ever found their spirit injured by it. I have found them proud, insubordinate, contentious, even in their ordinary stations in life; the very opposite of "each esteeming others better than themselves." In Churches so constituted, there is every thing to destroy docility in the hearer, and to take all authority from the teacher.

But I should have learned nothing of candour from the honest admission of my valued friend, if I did not as freely admit the evil which corrupt nature has introduced into the system which I advocate, and to which I continue attached. There is evil in it, which every Christian member of the Establishment deploras from his very soul, but which he is perfectly impotent to correct. But I cordially agree with Mr. Kelly, that we are to judge of a system by its principles, and not by its results, when those principles are worked by sinful fallen man.

I know many persons who were startled at the case stated by Mr. Kelly, p. 64, of a Cathedral congregation, all true Christians; and a little company assembled on the principles which he advocates, where the individual members were not true Christians; and at his declaration that he would join himself to

the last, and not to the first. I fully agree with him that he should adhere to principles, even when circumstances appeared against him. If the little body, without being joined by real Christians, was indeed founded on Scripture principles, it ought to have the presence of Mr. Kelly, and of every one who acknowledged those principles, although other real Christians deserted it. I agree with Mr. Kelly, we ought to act upon Scriptural principles, and not follow men, even Christian men; and therefore, as I do believe Mr. Kelly's Church to be, in all the essential principles of its constitution, unsupported by Scripture, and as I do believe that diocesan Episcopacy is framed after the example given us in Scripture, after a pattern which I believe to have been given by Divine Wisdom, for the very purpose of guidance as to the form of Christian Churches. I feel myself obliged, in conscience, to adhere to a Church in which there is diocesan Episcopacy. I should feel myself obliged to do so if every one that I considered a real Christian joined such Churches as that with which Mr. Kelly is connected. With the Scriptures in my hands, I could not offer myself, a baptized believer, to be received or rejected as a fellow-worshipper, by any number of individuals who might be associated together; no example of any such practice being found in Scripture. I need not go through the particulars which I believe to be unscriptural or antisciptural, in which I could not join; I should be obliged to continue in an Episcopal Church, in one in which there was a descending current of authority, if every other Christian had thought it his duty to leave it. But this is only an extreme case, put for the sake of argument.

I feel thankful to Mr. Kelly for the very candid, perhaps too favourable, account he has given of the Lord's work in the Establishment. I, with unfeigned gratitude, and deep sense of unworthiness, acknowledge the Lord's hand to have been with us. In spite of immense evil in the working of the system, in spite of the masses of spiritual death that fill so large a proportion of the places of authority and influence, the Lord has been graciously pleased to own the Established Church for the salvation of souls and the enlargement of the Redeemer's Kingdom. I do not know that the history of the Church of Christ affords a more signal instance of revival than that which has taken place in the Church of Ireland within the last fifteen or twenty years. Our God has evidently manifested himself to be in the midst of us to bless us, not for our works or deservings, but according to his own purpose and grace. Therefore, I am not only constrained to stay in the Established Church by principle, because I could not conscientiously concur in the principle upon which any but an Episcopal Church is established; but I have the happiness of labouring in a Church which God is signally blessing and making use of, for the purpose of gathering souls into the fold of Christ, and feeding them with food on which they may grow in grace. I deeply lament and deplore

the evils in the Establishment, but, if possible, I more lament the evils that are in the spiritual Church of Christ, spread as it is through various denominations; I grieve over their divisions, jealousies, selfishness, worldliness, want of devotedness and of spirituality, want of love, want of bearing with one another. I grieve not a little that Churches, which may be composed of tares and wheat until the harvest, should be so corrupt, so far from what they ought to be; but much more that Christians, who are brands plucked out of the burning, who are heirs of God, and joint-heirs of Christ, should bear so faintly the image of Christ, should exhibit so little of the Spirit of Christ; that they should not be spiritual, but carnal, even babes in Christ. Was there more of spirituality, there would be less evil resulting from the external separation of differently constituted Churches. I grieve over the difference in Church constitution existing between my dear friend Mr. Kelly and myself: I feel pain when circumstances lead me to express that difference; but it diminishes the evil to know, that though we cannot go to the House of God as friends, we can take sweet counsel together on the great realities of salvation, upon the grace and love of the Saviour, and upon the great features of a Christian life and conversation; whilst, unhappily, we separate on the Sabbath on the earth, we can meet at other times as those who shall together keep the Holy Sabbath in heaven; when we shall wonder at the blindness and the perverseness of each and both of us, and join in wonder and praise at the forbearance, and tenderness, and long-suffering of a common God and Saviour. Our difference is an evil, an offence to our one God and one Lord, but an evil which we cannot help until the Lord gives us both better spiritual sight, by which we may both see the same Scripture in the same point of view.

But God brings good out of this great evil: he tries and exercises our Christian love; a love more evidently founded upon a connexion with a common Saviour, and a common hope, because it is not fed by a common Church on earth. May we be grateful to the common Lord, who bears with us, and may He pour upon us more truth, more light, and more love.

R. D.

A TOUR TO ST. DOULOUGH'S, AND SO ON TO THE BOYNE, AND ELSEWHERE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

DEAR MR. EDITOR—In answer to your request that I would furnish a tour or country sketch, in order to enliven the sometimes too controversial and dogmatic character of your journal, which, it is possible the ladies of the Parsonage-house sometimes complain of; I send you the following paper, which, according to your pleasure and my leisure, may be the first of a series.

In this instance I am not desirous to range far; for the very idea of a tour to the black North, or rainy South, in this cloudy and inclement weather, is enough to infect one with a catarrh. I shall, then, make but a suburban excursion, and proceed but a few miles, and that with all comfortable leisure—I beg to be considered as no time-beating traveller. When I was a youth, (and the associations of that period are always connected in my mind with pleasure,) travelling was a leisurely process, and so I desire it to be still. The stupidest journey I ever took, and the one that fixed on me for days the most moidering head-ache, was a railway ride from Manchester to Liverpool. Defend me from such rides! If ever I ride fast, which I suppose I never again shall, let it be on a bounding horse, that forms part, as it were, of your own life, and which you can urge and compel, according to your own wilfulness; but to rattle, and quiver, and slide on with an expedition that gives you, what I can suppose, the giddiness of intoxication, without its gladness; a velocity that makes you look with vacancy on the rapidly passing scene; where you have no time to scent the fragrance of the hawthorn, or admire the cowslip as it spangles the lawn, or the violet, as it embroiders the bank, where—

“Banks, trees, and skies, in quick disorder run.”

This is too bad: it may do as a business concern; it may suit counting-house men, the bag men of Birmingham, or the cottoners of Manchester: but I utterly renounce steam-travelling for pleasure; nay, I do not much approve of coach-riding; though I feel that I have given some, and got much more, amusement and entertainment while moving in a public vehicle, even though it was an omnibus or caravan: but a jaunting-car for my money—an out-side jaunting-car, on which you can step, or off which you can jump, as you please; the vehicle that is *your* slave, instead of you being the vehicle's slave; that is, your humble and patient attendant while gathering stones, or picking up flowers; while you are gaping, or gossiping, or sketching—

the machine that conveys you, in all its patient humility, without the road cart, or insolence, or oaths, or exactions of guard or coachman; and which carries in its capacious well, not only your carpet bag, but all the trash about which you are busied; your plants, minerals, and such like nonsense. And now, *apropos* to the word nonsense, how evident it is from the aforesaid *verbiage* that I, like many a writer for a Magazine, feel very awkward in making a beginning, and am somewhat like those, who, fearful of making a good plunge into swimming water, splash at first amongst the shallows—showing an idle and ungainly timidity of rushing at once into the deep.

Well, suppose me sat fairly down, determined to write a tour, in some respects like what I have heretofore supplied you with: and where shall I go? I already said it shall be a narrow and suburban one. Shall it then be Southwards? No: for besides moving in that direction before, as you, Sir, may recollect, in my tour to Glendalough, I don't like to go where every one goes, because every body goes, and because nobody pays turn-pike. Moreover, I am confident there is much more to be observed, and much more to be said concerning what is before you on the North side of Dublin. Even in a picturesque point of view, the North has the advantage; for from that rich inclined plain, that for four or five miles slopes down to the bay, there is the whole prospect gained of the South side: the rich and splendid panorama, which its shores, its hills, its mountains present; besides, it possesses points of view peculiarly its own, afforded by Howth, Ireland's Eye, Lambay, and the Skerries Islands: then how exuberantly rich is it in historic recollections and antiquarian treasures; churches ruined, or still standing, whose age must be told off by centuries—round towers, and Cryptic oratories, where Patrick prayed and preached; castles baronial or ecclesiastical; palaces of prelates, and ruins where once councils sat, and parliaments were convened; and monuments denoting the successive power of Milesian, Dane, and Norman. Nay, the very people marked off and peculiar. The Fingallians, or white strangers, as their name signifies, are still a taller and fairer race than is seen in almost any other part of Ireland; and as you enter Lusk, Skerries, or Rush, you observe the men more athletic, the women better-favoured than the natives of the adjoining districts. Then to a botanist, or geologist, the islands of Lambay, Holm Patrick, and Ireland's Eye are full of interest; as also is the promontory of Howth, with its baronial castle, its ruined abbey, and its peculiar position, so like Gibraltar, and so possible of being made a similar fortress, to hold in future check the rebel Irish. All these are interesting; and he must be in the predicament of Sterne's traveller, who would travel from Dan to Beersheba without making a remark, that could not, in the wide and varied field of Fingal find materials for supplying amusement and information to himself and others.

On the contrary, the South side of Dublin is comparatively

new; like America, however beautiful, it is deficient in the interest connected with ancient monuments and historic recollections; it has a raw, pert, commercial expenditure all about it; it has no grey and moss-clad gentility. The exuberance of upstart prosperity has lavished, it is true, a thicket of houses, and belted lawns, and ponds, and gardens, and graperies, and snuggeries; the very churches are absurdly apish of a Gothic form, without taste or *vraisemblance*, tricked out with misplaced, though expensive ornaments of points and pinnacles; some for all the world like a dead crab or centipede, lying on its back, with all its claws upwards—these like Old St. Doulough, or Lusk!!! yea, just as like as a city knight is, in his port and bearing, to a De Courcy, a De Burgho, or a St. Lawrence.

What then is the South side of Dublin but a large country town, or a town country? and what are Mount Merrion, and Mount Anville, and all the slopes and eminences that ascend up to the Military Road, and the Three-rock Mountain, but like a wholesale haberdasher's counter, covered with shawls, ribbons, and band-boxes, and where all is very fine and very new—where there is much costliness and little taste. On the contrary, let the *gentle* reader come along with me, and pass Annesley-bridge, and I will introduce him at once to the beautiful demesne of Marino, the creation and the delight of the elegant and patriot Earl of Charlemont, he who did more to make Ireland a literary country, than any other before or after him. Observe with what effective ingenuity the grounds are laid out, and cast your eyes on yonder exquisite temple; what a concentration of taste is here; how Italy must have chastened and matured the man's mind who contrived and executed that beautiful fane. I have seen it when a boy, and though I knew not then the Gothic from the Ionic order, I thought it the perfection of architecture; and now as an elder, I still dwell on it with peculiar complacency, and consider that nothing I have seen abroad or at home is superior to it. What a contrast this, to what I have been just remarking on; to the band-boxes of haberdashers, and the tea-chests of grocers, and the fish-kettles of fish-mongers, that in the shape of country houses cumber all the soil from Dublin to Kingstown.

I am taking the road to St. Doulough's by Artane; to my left is Marino; to my right the rich plain that extends until it meets the town and castle of Clontarf. Just eight hundred years ago was this plain agreed on by both parties as the battlefield of as murderous a conflict as the annals of time record. Peaceable as I am by profession, and as I trust I am by nature, and though abhorring war and strife perhaps as much as any inhabitant of this our land of Ire, yet I do not see why I may not advert to this battle, which throws a light on the character and history of my country.

This battle was not fought to drive out the Danish intruders; nor was it a contest where all on one side were foreigners, and on

the other natives. No: but it was to decide which of two Irish parties was to have the upper hand; and the Danes acted merely as auxiliaries, and gave, as they had often done before, their powerful but mercenary assistance to the rival kings of the country. At Clontarf they fought on the side of Maolmurdha, King of Leinster, as on a former occasion they were employed by Brian Boiroihme himself, when he was aspiring to the sovereignty, which they mainly aided him to arrive at. The fact is, that the patriot Brian was the Bonaparte of the Irish drama. He, by a series of successful intrigues and enterprises, had deposed Malachy O'Maelseachlin, the descendant of a long line of monarchs, from his station: and he held his fresh sceptre but as a successful usurper. And even in his old age he was not only hated and envied by the man whom he had deposed, but also by the young and ardent King of Leinster, who, fond of a fight, as all Irishmen ever have been, took occasion to pick a quarrel with the sovereign about a gold button, and a move at chess; first being assured of the assistance of the Danes, who, in those days roamed the wide world for the pure love of spoiling and slaughtering, "*Bello gaudentes, prælio ridentes*;" as one of their own historians characterizes them. And so on Cluan Torf, the Bull's field, that rich pasture from whence many a bull was brought to be baited, and many a bullock to be slaughtered for the sport and recreation of the citizens of Dublin; on this open field, where there could be no ambuscade or no advantage taken on either side, except what sun and wind allowed, was the battle fought, on Good-Friday. The Irish, who are the historians of the fray, assert that the Danes chose this sacred day, pursuant to the devilish suggestions of a Pagan Oracle; but it is to be surmised that this is a slander, invented by the talking, against the silent party—the world is full of these left-handed advantages. Surely the Irish have been, with all their Catholicity, never very delicate about fighting days: a patron day is, up to this very year 1834, a very convenient occasion for a pitched battle; and sweet Tipperary knows, and so does the good Borough of Clonmel, how, 800 years after the day of Clontarf, Christmas-day was consecrated by the abundant flow of Catholic blood from broken Catholic heads. Many a bloody holiday has indeed occurred since the Good-Friday of the battle of Clontarf: and what are priests good for, if they cannot shrive the children of the Island of Saints, and so sanctify the deed as well as the day.

O'Maelseachlin, the deposed monarch of Ireland, but now the petty King of Meath, does not seem, any more than Louis the XVIII. or James the Second, to have been fond of fighting. With his Meath-men he contentedly looked on, while the Leinster-men, backed by the Danes, were hacking at the Munster-men; and lustily they did it, if we are to believe O'Maelseachlin, who, if he would not draw his sword, was ready to draw his pen on the occasion. "It is impossible (says he, writing to his clan) for

human language to describe this battle; an angel from heaven *only* could give a correct idea of the terrors of that day. We retired to the distance of a fallow field from the combatants, the high wind of the spring blowing from them towards us; when both the armies engaged and grappled in close fight, the swords that glittered over them, gleaming with the rays of the sun, gave the appearance of a flock of white sea-gulls, flying in the air. Their strokes were so mighty that great quantities of hair, shorn from their heads by their sharp weapons, were driven far off by the high wind: the battle lasted not half an hour until neither of the two armies could discern each other; nor could one know his father or his brother, even if he were next to him. We, (that is the lookers on,) were covered all over, both faces, arms, heads, hair, and clothes, with red drops of blood, borne from the combatants, on the wings of the wind; and should we attempt to assist them, we could not, (what a liar!) for our arms were entangled with the locks of their hair, which were cut off by the swords, and blown towards us by the wind, so that we were all the time engaged in disentangling our arms!!! And it was wonderful that those who were in the battle could endure such horror without running distracted. They fought from sun-rise until the dusk of the evening."

It would appear from the surprising expenditure of hair on this occasion, that the practice of the Irish of wearing glibbs, or matted locks, was common 800 years ago, and that this natural and proper defence of their craniums served them for helmet and vizor.

This was a most desperately contested field: even when the account is disencumbered of all the exaggerations of Hibernian fancy, the records of warfare scarcely furnish a parallel to it. The leaders and officers were almost all slaughtered; Brian Boiroihme and his two sons, the King of Leinster, and *all* the Danish leaders. Both armies beat each other off the field of battle; the remnant of the Danes took to their shipping, or to the walls of Dublin; the Leinster-men fled westward, and the Munster-men retreated across the Liffey, and took up ground at Kilmainham. All parties were so crippled that they were never able to raise their heads again. O'Maelseachlin reaped the reward of his caution, and recovered his monarchy without a blow: and Ireland was so reduced that from the day of Clontarf may be dated that imbecility and disunion that prepared the way, 140 years after, for the English conquest.

Amongst all the battles fought in Ireland, and few countries on earth can record so many, the battle of Clontarf is the most memorable: yet I never could understand why the Irish are so proud of it. It was sheer *mad animal* fighting—such as became a field of bulls. The Munster Dalgais, and the roving Danes were inured to battle and bloodshed from their infancy.

The Danes were new converts to Christianity; the Irish had professed it for 500 years, and yet its meek and merciful spirit

had as little effect on the old professors of the Island of Saints, as on the new of Scandinavia. The Northmen still followed their raven standard, that seemed to croak them on to blood and murder; and of the Irish it was said, and their deeds did not give the lie to the relation, that in order to work all ferocity with greediness, the male child of the true Milesian, when dipped in the laver of baptism, had the right hand held out of the regenerating water; intending that it should remain still ready to perpetrate Paynim deeds.

On the plain of Clontarf and its vicinity, swords and other weapons and arms are still dug up, and human bones of larger size than usual are said to be still disinterred. Not long ago, skeletons of great length were found near Baldoyle; and Harris mentions, in his edition of Ware's Antiquities, that near Coolock was raised, in his time, the bones of a man, who, according to accurate measurement, must have stood nine feet in height. Clontarf town is, to please me, the prettiest and most habitable village in the vicinity of Dublin; it is clean and quiet, and reminds you of a lady of a certain age who sits in quiet and unobtrusive respectability, and has left the din of the world behind her; the village surrounded by full-grown trees, and with the fine baronial castle of the Vernons at its upper end; its venerable church standing on the site of the monastery erected A.D. 550, and its wood-enveloped churchyard, forms such a contrast to the busy, bustling scene exhibited in the villages at the other side of the city, where all is cursing and whiskey drinking, and where "*differtum navitis Campanibus atque malignis.*" Kingstown exposes to her dust-covered visitors her raw vulgarity. This Castle of Clontarf perhaps is one of the oldest edifices in Ireland; erected by the Norman Netterville, in the reign of Henry II., as a Commandery of Knights Templar: it remained in the hands of that mystified corporation until, in the year 1312, when on the morrow of St. Lucia the Virgin, and when moreover the moon appeared covered with blood, the Order of Knights Templar was suppressed. Their houses and some of their possessions were handed over to the Knights Hospitallers of Jerusalem. The Commandery of Clontarf followed the fortunes of Kilmainham, the head establishment of the Templars in Ireland; and so Clontarf became, as well as Kilmainham, an hospital. But the reader is not by any means to suppose that an hospital, in these good old Popish days, signified what it does now; for these hospitals were for the reception of guests, who came seeking for accommodation, with hawk on hand and hounds in leash, with a troop of horse and dog boys in their train,* while the sick and infirm were totally excluded. Clontarf

* Not only gentle strangers and lordly travellers were admitted to the casual hospitality of these houses, but also certain gentlefolks, who had interest obtained what were called corrodies, or permanent fixtures on the establishment, viz: A. D. 1338, Roger, Prior of Kilmainham granted to Master Walter

continued a Commandery, under Kilmainham, until the Reformation. As this Castle of Clontarf was witness to one of the principal events, and as the narrative is pregnant with characteristics of the times, and of the way in which a military priest could carry his high head, and have, in spite of King or Commons, his own way, I may as well sketch a brief story for the reader.

In the year 1461, James Keating succeeded Sir Thomas Talbot, as Prior of Kilmainham; and no sooner was he inducted, than he began, as follows, his *official conduct*. He assaulted Sir Rowland Dowdall, Deputy Lord Treasurer and Justice of the King's Bench, on the high road, as the worthy functionary was going on a pilgrimage to Saint Glanokis, and with a drawn sword put him in fear and danger of his life; and in spite of a complaint before Parliament, and a process against him in the King's Bench, he slighting and evading the consequences of both, and set the law at defiance, stating that no mention was made, in the writ with which he was served, as to what King's Bench summoned him, whether of Ireland or England. He reversed all the acts and deeds of the two former priors. In the reign of Edward IV. it seems a Doctor Marcellus, a foreigner from Rome, came into Ireland, and created frequent disturbance amongst the clergy; and in support of the usurpations and alleged rights of the Pope, he stirred up the Friars to many acts inimical to the King's authority; whereupon a royal mandate was issued, that this said Italian should depart the kingdom within a month, and in case he returned, that he should be apprehended as an enemy to his Majesty, and that any one who should harbour him should be adjudged a felon and a traitor. Notwithstanding, the Prior of Kilmainham did afford shelter to the mischief maker; and it would appear that the King's mandate, though strengthened by an Act of Parliament, was a *brutum fulmen* that could not wound the

Islip, during life, a corrody for himself, two armigers, or upper servants, a chamberlain, and another servant, five boys and five horses. The said Walter to sit at the right hand of the Prior, at his own table, thereby to be more commodiously served, (what care Master Islip took of himself,) as well in eating as in drinking. The chamberlain to have his place with the brothers of the house, and the servants with those of the Prior." "That he should eat in said house as often as he pleased, together with his chaplain and squires: that he should be allowed for himself three white loaves, equal in size to the Prior's and his chaplain; and seven loaves the same as the brothers in the house, and ten flaggons of the best ale. And from the kitchen, beef, mutton, and pork, raw or drest, at his own option, in like manner as the Prior was served, together with roast meat, or soup."

This was the way in which charitable funds were applied in Popsich times. This Walter Islip was truly a proper resident for a religious hospital, for mine author relates that said Roger, amongst other covenants in his corrody, had it fixed that whenever he should dine in the hall or at the Prior's table, he should be allowed for his evening's potation THREE flaggons of the best ale; and that in seasons of Lent, and other fasting times, he should be served with meat as usual, except he chose to abstain from it.

ecclesiastical swordsman. For a year or two afterwards we find him as constable of the Castle of Dublin, fortifying it with men-at-arms against Lord Henry Grey, the deputy; and in order to keep the Viceroy out, breaking down the bridge between the Castle and the city. Neither was he the worse for *this*; for in the same year, 1478, we find him joined in commission with the Archbishop of Dublin and the Earl of Kildare, proceeding to London on weighty business relative to Ireland; and returning from the royal court, he continued to deport himself as a stout prince-priest for four years afterwards. But on complaint being made to the Grand Master of Rhodes, he was formally deprived of his dignity as Prior of Kilmainham; and, in truth, the charges against him were neither few nor frivolous; for, not only was he accused of mal-administration, violence, and disobedience, but that he had pledged the jewels belonging to the Hospital, and what was worse than all, pawned its sacred relics—not only the pairings of nails, and hair, and rags of saints, but a piece of the true Cross!!! It is no wonder that such a man as Keating should want money, and perhaps he would pledge his soul to obtain it; but where were the brokers that would pass a pawn duplicate for such inviolable property as this; but such is Popery—when profligacy and sanctimoniousness meet together, usury and superstition may kiss each other. The Grand Master of Rhodes appointed Marmaduke Lumley, a high-born Englishman, to succeed Keating, and for that purpose he landed at Clontarf, and possessed himself of the Commandery House there. But our sturdy Irishman, on receiving notice of the arrival of his supplanter, proceeded instantly to the village with a well-appointed band of followers—burst into the Castle—put Lumley into arrest—pushed him down into the dungeon, and there kept him until he resigned into his hands all his documents, and then he sent him off to a small preceptory in the county of Louth, where the baffled man died of a broken heart. Keating had continued in all his turbulent ways so far prosperous, that he could not abstain from attempting to make a king of Ireland; therefore, when Lambert Simnell landed in the country, the Prior of Kilmainham took a leading part in his favour, and when he failed of success, though deprived of his constableness of Dublin Castle, yet for three years more, in spite of the Government, he kept forcible possession of Kilmainham, whence, with no small difficulty, he was ejected, and, neither hanged nor beheaded, this turbulent specimen of a soldier churchman died in quiet obscurity.*

* I am tempted (in order to impress the reader more fully with the character of the clergy of that Church which has declared herself to be unobscured and unchangeable) to give from that admirable work, "Phelan's Policy of the Church of Rome," his account of other clergymen besides Keating, on occasion of their joining in the conspiracy in favour of Lambert Simnell:—

"A bull was directed to the four prelates who had not leagued in the

We shall now leave Clontarf, and proceed along to the Malahide road, by Artane; and here again a historic recollection

rebellion, commanding them to excommunicate their offending brethren; and the delinquents would have experienced the utmost severity of papal vengeance, had not the monarch declared his willingness to admit them to pardon, upon the easy terms of acknowledging their fault, and renewing their oaths of allegiance. Sir Richard Edgecumbe, the officer sent over by the king to receive the submission of the lords and prelates of the pale, has left us copies of the oaths which were taken on the occasion: they were 'devised by himself, as sure as he could;' and cost him the labour of many days in the discussion of the several articles with these refractory penitents. The oath for the lay lords is on the model of the old oath of a feudal vassal; with a clause at the end, that the party 'will not let, ne cause to be letted, the execution and declaration of the great censures of holy church, to be done agenst any person of what estate, degree, or condition he be, by any archbushopp, bushopp, &c. according to the authority of our most holy father Pope Innocent the Elgth, that now is, agenst all theme of the king's subgetts, that lett or trouble our said sovereign lord king Henry the Seventh.' The same pledges were exacted of the bishops, with an additional declaration, that 'as oft as they should be required, they would execute the censures of the church, on behalf of their sovereign lord, agenst all those of his subgetts, of what dignity, degree, state, or condition he be, that letteth or troubleth his seyd sovereign lord.'"

"The attempt made to elude the force of these oaths, is a strong instance of that detestable casuistry, by which the schoolmen of the church of Rome have seared the natural susceptibility of conscience. When at length every difficulty appeared to be adjusted, it was demanded by Kildare, the leader of the rebellion, that the host on which they were to be sworn should be consecrated by one of his own chaplains. This demand involved, literally, a *mystery of iniquity*, which the rude proposer could never have fathomed for himself, and which few Roman Catholic laymen of the present day will be able to comprehend without a particular explanation. It has long been a doctrine of the Papal Church, republished at Trent under the sanction of a curse upon all who deny it, that the *intention* of the officiating priest is necessary for the validity of a religious rite. The conspirators were assured that the intention of Kildare's chaplain would be cordially in their favour: thus the form of consecration would be the juggling illusion of a mountebank; the wafer would be no host: and the protestation made upon it, 'so help me *this* holy sacrament of God's body, in form of bread *here present*, to my salvation or damnation,' however awful in its terms, would have no meaning, and consequently no terrors, to those whom the prelates should initiate into so comfortable a secret. But Edgecombe was aware of the perfidy of the demand: he insisted that the mass should be celebrated by his own chaplain, and has left us a description of the whole ceremony, which shows the appalling character of the ineditated prevarication."

catches up my spirit, and I cannot refrain from indulging in it. On the left of the road is the remnant of an old church, and near it a ruinous heap, where once was perpetrated a fearful work of vengeance and murder on an Archbishop of Dublin. The place seems sombre and sad, as still suffering under the interdict placed on it for this deed of blood and sacrilege. John Allen was a political intriguer—a cunning, rather than a wise man. Employed nine years in Rome amongst the "*Aulici Romani*," no wonder that he was learned in all the tortuous practices of those holy politicians; and so Wolsey took him up, and first employed him as commissioner for the suppression of the smaller English monasteries, and then sent him over into Ireland, as Archbishop of Dublin and Lord Chancellor, in order to work the ruin, if possible, of the Geraldines, against whom Wolsey had taken up an immense hatred, and that because, in the presence of his King, the Earl of Kildare had, with his bold and warrior-like eloquence, got the better of the cunning priest and polished courtier. On Allen's arrival in Ireland, politician as he was, he was not successful; for Kildare, who was appointed Lord Deputy, deprived him of the seals; and so fearful was the prelate of the power of him to whom he was notoriously opposed, that he thought it prudent to sue out the King's pardon for all offences he might have committed in his past life. How insecure must this churchman have felt, who resorted to the common refuge of the guilty, in order to shield his head from the blows of his adversaries; and how strange would it be for an Archbishop of Dublin now-a-days to attempt to cheat the public executioner, by seeking for a pardon before it was shown that he needed one! But the prelate's day was yet to dawn, in which he could be avenged of his adversaries. The Geraldines were too imprudent, too lordly, too reckless of consequences, to avoid the snares of those who were on the watch to catch them. Lord Kildare did what no Viceroy of Ireland ever did with safety; he made himself a partizan in the differences of the natives; he took a part in favour of some Irish septs, to whom he was related; and such information was given of his partiality to the Irish, that he was summoned over to give an account of his government, before his sovereign. The Earl of Kildare, one of the ablest of his race, though rash and fiery himself, had for his son and heir one still more impetuous and proud; and with an impudence which brought his ancient house to the verge of ruin, he, when departing for England, appointed this unruly lord, who was yet beardless, to be his deputy in the government. This was a fine opportunity for Allen, and he was not idle in taking advantage of it. Aware of the self-sufficiency of this proud youth, the Bishop and his creature and namesake, the Master of the Rolls, did their best to chafe and goad him into intemperate conduct; and every day some bitter repartee or taunt was exchanged between them. At length a rumour was put into circulation, that the Earl of Kildare was seized and beheaded in the Tower of London, and that all his brethern were likely to

suffer the same fate. The rash youth at once fell into the trick ; he rushed in fiery mood before the Council Board, surrendered the sword of state, and the same hour saw the same man a viceroy and a rebel—and a dangerous rebel too; he made a common cause with the discontented Irish ; he enlisted a large body of troops ; wasted the country round Dublin with fire and sword, and laid siege to the city ; and had the Butlers entered into the confederacy, which the Lord Thomas proposed to them, Ireland might have been lost to England. On this occasion Lord Thomas, as a good Papist, sent an embassy to the Pope ; and his Holiness, who has ever been the refuge and the rallying point of the disloyal world, would, had the rebel been prosperous, have clapped him on the back, and said, "Well done, my son." Allen was so far successful; he had cheated the Geraldine into rebellion ; but, perhaps, he did not calculate on the fierce manner in which it was to be conducted. His courage was not equal to his cunning ;—and so when Lord Thomas laid siege to the Castle of Dublin, afraid of being taken, and of course hanged, under the advantage of a spring tide, he took ship at Dame's Gate, for England ; but the vessel, unable to clear the bay, and driven back by contrary winds, was stranded at Clontarf, and the Archbishop was forced to come on shore, and take shelter in a small castle near the village of Artane. Lord Thomas had soon information that his enemy was within his reach, and accordingly, early on the following morning, he repaired thither, with his retainers ; and two confidential men, who preceded their master, rushed into the Bishop's room, tore him out of bed, and in his shirt, bare-headed and barefooted, brought the venerable man before his enemy. The prelate fell on his knees, and, in suppliant voice, implored pity, for the love of God, on a Christian and an Archbishop. It is allowed that the young Geraldine looked with compassion on his abased enemy ; it is confessed he had no desire to have him slaughtered ; but, with the insolence which the Anglo-Irish had learned from the Milesians to use towards the natives of England, whom they delighted to consider as mean and churlish, he turned aside from the kneeling Bishop, and said "*Bier uaim a boddagh ;*" that is "*Take away the clown*"—meaning, it is supposed, that he should be removed and placed in safe custody ; but his servants, wilfully mistaking their master's words, beat out the Bishop's brains, and left a revenge on themselves which overtook them all ; for the two men who perpetrated the murder died of loathsome diseases. Fitzgerald and all his uncles, subsequently defeated, and hunted through Ireland, were obliged to surrender themselves, and were forwarded to England for trial ; and when, on their voyage, the captain told them that his ship was named the Cow, the old prophecy was called to mind, that an Earl's five sons should be wafted to England in the belly of a cow, but should never return. With sorrowful hearts, therefore, they proceeded to London, where, in the tower, they were beheaded. Thus ended the career of Archbishop Allen, and of that proud Geraldine, whom his followers, from the splendour of

his train and trappings, named Silken Thomas ; and if ever the Romance of Irish history is taken in hands, no doubt the writer will give the interesting story of Silken Thomas, and the strange and varied fortunes of his younger brother, Gerald, a prominent place in his collection. Persons who are fond of placing their marks, and giving their own direction to the Almighty's vengeful bolts, observe that Archbishop Allen deservedly met his fate, for having a hand in the sacrilege of suppressing the English monasteries. And thus Godwin, Bishop of Hereford, fixes the fate of those who had hand, act, or part, in this affair: two of them fought a duel—one was killed, and the other hanged; a third threw himself headlong into a well; a fourth, though a rich man afterwards, came to beg his bread; Wolsey, stripped of the King's favour, died miserably; and the Pope, who gave his consent to the dissolution, lived to see Rome sacked, and himself and his cardinals made prisoners, amidst the mockery and outrage of a licentious multitude. Allen, it appears, though a turbulent and intriguing spirit, was a man of hospitality and learning, a diligent inquirer into antiquities, and an active prelate in his diocese. His successors are indebted to him for that ample registry of the state of the churches in his see, which is still in existence, called the *Liber Niger*. It may be worth observing that the primates of the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland—Becket, Allen, and Sharpe—met a similar fate, in consequence of meddling in political intrigues—giving their mind to what, if they wished to be true members of that order of which Timothy and Titus were prototypes, they should have cast behind them. But, as the Spanish proverb has it, "it is hard to straighten a crooked cucumber."

Artane looks poor and gloomy; it seems, as we have before observed, that the curse of the Papal interdict, inflicted on it in consequence of the murder of an Archbishop, was not yet removed. Popery certainly had a good and full-mouthed knack of cursing. On this occasion it anathematized the murderers, and interdicted poor Artane as follows:—

"May no man be merciful to them; may their memory be forgotten; may God rain on them flames of fire and sulphur; may they clothe themselves with this malediction and high curse every day when they put on their garments; may the water of vengeance be in their inward parts, as marrow in their bones; may they be girded with the girdles of malefactors, and partakers with Pharoah, Nero, Herod, Judas, the proditors of Jesus; and may they descend into hell quick. Good Lord, send them hunger and thirst; strike them with pestilence, that they be consumed, and their generation clean eradicated; strike them with madness, leprosy, and blindness, &c. &c. And we interdict all the places where they go, and the place where the Archbishop was murdered."

So much for Artane. I may now get on to St. Doulough's. There are sundry things to stop me, and on which I might gossip away,

but I shall leave them aside, until I write a history of Fingall, and dedicate it, so please you, to the Editors of the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

At some distance, this church I am now approaching looks like others that are decorated with a spire; to be sure it stands in a better selected position than most modern churches, which are generally *near* a good situation, on a ridge of land that runs from the west towards the sea; but, after all, this spire is a pert, awkward citizen like thing, that marks off the taste and munificence of a vestry of Dublin merchants; but when you get near—when you rise to the elevation on which it stands, and observe the grey time-tinted aspect of the edifice—when you see presented before you its *bizarre* and fantastic structure—the sharp elevation of its lofty and cryptic roofs—the tower rising from the centre—the low and flat arch doorway, its numerous and picturesque angles, its multitudinous and many-shaped windows—you must acknowledge that it is as odd and curious a structure as ever your eye lit upon; and I challenge you, reader, to find me its match in the British Isles, or even in Christendom. Whoever built it—and I am sure I know him not—if he had not architectural taste, had certainly an eye for the picturesque, and he seemed desirous to present, in as small a compass as possible, all varieties of arch, angle, and window; and so he perforated his building with orifices, varying from the round abortive square hole and loop-hole to the most florid and ornate gothic window. I repeat it, that the spire that some Dublin merchant caused to be erected of wood, and crusted over with *patent* slates, destroys the singular effect of the building, it is the imposition of a modern absurdity on an ancient *extravaganza*. It looks as it were a deranged old nun, who, in the full habiliments of her order, has put on a leghorn bonnet “*a la mode de Paris*.” What a fanciful monk, friar, or anchorite, it was that contrived and constructed this building; what turns, contrivances, holes, passages, and staircases; what a conglomeration of arches and demi-arches, pointed circular, contrasted, and elliptic, of which it is impossible to trace the centreing, or, in some instances, the support. And the whole thing is so minute. Before I have done I may somehow or somewhere give the dimensions; but here I will say that he must have been a little man, let him be Dane or Irish, who had it constructed; my life for it, it was *not* the nine feet Scandinavian, whose skeleton was dug up at Coolock, that was the builder. As for me; I had to double myself to enter the door, to squeeze and stoop to ascend the spiral staircases, for there are more than one; and to what is shown as the saint's tomb and the saint's bed; and I assure you, gentle reader, that if I was cut in two, the half of me would not fit at length in either one or the other. But let me be a little more particular, and try to describe more in detail. This edifice stands about fifty yards Westwards from the road: a lane leads up to it, which is, as usual in most approaches to old places in Ireland, filthy and disgusting in the extreme, and I had to rejoice in a pair of thick soled shoes, as

I trudged through the soap-suds and liquid nuisance that exuded from the cabins on either side. Opposite to the entrance to the lane, and on the road side, is a low granite cross; it was formerly in the churchyard, its proper place, whence it was about ten years ago taken and planted in its present position; why, I cannot tell. It now most commonly serves as a scratching-post



for pigs, and dogs, and asses. The churchyard lies high, and commands a fine view: the building stands not due East and

West; the dimensions, as I observed before, are diminutive, being about forty-eight feet in length; the walls and roof are constructed of the durable blue limestone of the neighbourhood, the stones well squared, and the cement, by lapse of time, has become exceeding hard: there is no stone roof in Ireland that rises with so acute an angle, except, perhaps, that of Cormack's Chapel, on the Rock of Cashel. A singular porch projects from the South side of the tower, the lower part of which contains the door-way, low and imperfectly arched. The under part of the South-east angle of the porch is built in a buttress-like form; above this it is bevelled off for a short distance, the angle thus formed containing a window; it then becomes square, and is connected with the tower by a massive projection supported by receding arches, like the Church, cased and roofed with stone. The top of the porch is finished by a square parapet, which, as the people report, was formerly surmounted by the cross now in the street of the village. When you enter the interior you find that it consists of two unequal apartments; the entrance communicates with the smaller and Westward division, the partition-wall dividing the two apartments being nearly opposite the entrance; and attached to this partition, and just opposite as you enter, is what some call an altar, others the tomb of the saint; a sort of buttress, containing a spiral staircase, intrudes considerably on the area of this apartment. The altar or tomb I have just alluded to is two feet six inches broad, five feet long, two feet six inches high; a Gothic window of two compartments, of the description of arch called compressed, placed in the west end, gives light to the apartment; under which may be traced within, square-headed windows, now filled up by the accumulation of soil outside. In the North wall are three square recesses, said to have been also open to admit light, but now closed by the modern little place of Protestant worship, which may rather be called a church-reen, to use an Irish diminutive, than a Church: indeed this apartment, as every other in this singular edifice, was intended to be full of light, and I think there were six or seven windows in it, though it is not ten feet in length, or eight feet in breadth. And here I have somewhat to say concerning the incumbent of the parish; he may be, and I make no doubt is a very good and able minister, and I am to presume that he knows and does his duty in love; but I positively assert that he has no more taste than the squire who decorated the portraits of Vandyke, in his picture gallery, with scratch-wigs; for this worthy person has chosen to stop up all the windows he could reach to, with just such rough masonry as you would stop a barn window with, or repair a pig-sty; and thereby he has converted this lightsome and fantastic building into a dungeon: yes, but he did this, careful soul as he was, to keep out the village boys, who here, as every where else in Ireland, take delight in destruction, and like harpies, enter but to pollute and defile.

But, Rev. Sir, might you not have put in a few iron bars? They would not have cost so much as all the job work of mud and rubble-stone with which this ancient place is now obstructed and injured; but I say this in expostulation rather than in anger. I remember once being instrumental in having the voice of prayer and praise restored to a *dumb Church* in the County of Cork, where I saw a goat with as long a beard as that the Venerable Bede boasted in, peering with his cold green eye from its pulpit. In the same way I may, if this paper should meet the eye of any of the parishioners of St. Doulough's, be the means of provoking them to remove the rubbish that now encumbers the windows, and replace it with iron bars where necessary; and moreover, remove the spire, which is now going rapidly to decay, and which in a few years will, on some windy night, come down with a crash, destroying the old cryptic roofs; and thus this singular antique, which Dane, Norman, Saxon, Cromwellian, and Williamite had spared, will be demolished.—On the altar I have before alluded to, lies a large stone of blue marble, hollowed out in a shell-like form, and which was once a recipient for holy water; over the altar, in the wall, appears a semi-circular arch, now filled up with masonry, under which, on a level with the altar, may be distinguished a square aperture, having iron hooks remaining in one side, evidently intended as the hinges of a hatch or door. To the right of the entrance is a recess, contained in the buttress already mentioned, in which are two square-headed windows, looking towards the entrance into the churchyard; here, we may suppose, some watcher took his station in order to spy and report the approach of visitors. Between this recess and the altar a low, narrow, square-headed door-way communicates with the Eastern division of the church, through which, when you pass, even suppose you were low of stature, you must stoop considerably. The Eastern apartment occupies the entire space under the tower and Eastern crypt; distinguished from the other, it is lofty and cheerful, well illuminated by four windows, two on the South side, one larger on the East, and one on the North side: the first window, or that next the door, is under the tower, and consists of two compartments, in the florid Gothic style, trefoil-headed, and branching towards the top, which consists of a diamond shaped aperture. The other window to the South is much injured; the casing and mullions being severed. The Eastern window is, as usual, the largest in the edifice: it consists, also, of two compartments; and it seems, from its ornaments and structure, to have been the result of a more modern alteration; it is observable that in this window, as well as in the one of the Cathedral, as it is called, at Glendalough, and indeed in many other ancient structures in Ireland, that the mullions and ornamental frame-work of the windows are composed of Oolite, similar to Bath Stone, and which evidently was brought over sea, either from France or

England, as no such formation occurs in Ireland.* The window to the North is a plain Gothic, of one compartment; several of the iron bars to which the lead-work of the windows was attached, remain still. A portion of a large arch, being about a quadrate segment of a circle, appears in the North wall, as if it was intended to enlarge the building, and make a passage into the addition at this place. When you stamp on the floor of the apartment, a hollow sound reverberates as if there was an excavation beneath. A person some time since, as I was credibly informed, thrust a six-feet pole through a small aperture in the floor, and found no resistance; but though he desired to make further search, he was not permitted; and in this closed and mysterious vault it is supposed that the body of St. Doulough lies, and it is further believed, that from hence there is a hollow way to the holy well, and sacred bathing place of St. Catherine, about sixty yards to the North-east.

The stairs leading to the upper apartments and tower commence between the two South windows; a few at the bottom project into the area of the chapel, (if chapel it be;) they are supported by an arch, and are then passed into a turret resembling a heavy buttress, which projects from the South-east angle of the tower, and a short distance up communicates with a small closet in the porch on the south side. In this closet, which is not twice the size of a good sentry-box, are several apertures, for view or light, of all sizes and shapes, and a convenience for sitting; and it was, I should think, intended in the first instance, as a look-out station, and perhaps as a pulpit place from whence a congregation in the area beneath might be addressed: from this a sloping passage leads to a small low apartment over the West division, having two dissimilar Gothic lights placed one above the other, so close that the covering of the lower window serves as the base of the upper: to this room a spiral stairs in the Western division leads. On looking down this narrow screw, I observed a coffin: What!!! says I, to the woman who conducted me, "is any deceased person deposited here?" "Oh, no Sir, that's a cholera coffin, which we keep ready made." "I

* There is an oolite formation in the county of Mayo, near Killala, but the stone is blue, and quite distinct from the cream-coloured Portland or Bath stone. In proof of the stone work of this and similar windows being brought from England, it is known that cut-stone ornaments and windows for churches, abbeys, and castles, formed articles of commerce, and were usually obtained at Caen, in Normandy, and were sometimes brought from England to Ireland; for, in Archdale's *Monasticon*, we find that in the year 1250, the Abbot of St. Thomas, Dublin, having provided, at Bristol, a quantity of stone to build the church of that rich monastery, the Mayor and bailiffs of this town having seized on the stone to build a castle there, King Henry, on complaint of the Abbot, by writ directed the Mayor to restore the same, and permit the Irish Ecclesiastics to carry away the materials.

hope it's not a second-hand one." "By no means, Sir—thank God we have little use for such things here." Returning to the staircase, I walked to an apartment immediately under the roof, that occupies the entire space from end to end, and is about 36 feet long, but very narrow, the ends under the Eastern and Western stone roofs being not wider than seven feet and a half. The arches under the stone roofs are extremely rude, and, as if fearful that one was not sufficient to support the high and ponderous roof, a second arch in the rudest and most unworkmanlike way is inserted under the upper one; and here is observable a curious contrivance to secure lightness as well as strength and solidity. The stone composing the upper part of these pointed arches is of a light porous spongy consistence; at first view you would say it was pumice-stone, but when you examine it more closely, you find it to be a fresh-water tufa, formed by the deposit of water, highly impregnated with carbonate of lime. The very same formation is employed to construct the cryptic roof, the quoins and window-frames of the ancient chapel built on the island of Holm-Patrick, whose erection is attributed to our patron saint: nothing can answer better for durability and lightness than this material: it has stood on Holm-Patrick, and perhaps at St. Doulough's, for a thousand years, and is as unaffected by time as the hardest marble: I only wonder where such quantities of it could be got; for, in all my travels through Ireland I never saw a quarry, or place where it could be procured in any quantity. The part beneath the tower of this long apartment is rudely groined: in the East end is a small lancet light; in the West end another much dilapidated, but still showing the remains of ornament: over this is a large stone of the tufa formation I have above alluded to, in which is cut out an aperture in the shape of a shamrock; and which in its edges is as sharp as the day it was chiselled. In the recess on the porch is another lancet window; and the roof and walls are singularly perforated with square holes, through one of which when you look, your sight is directed, as through a telescope, to the holy well and the adjoining bath: was not this intended to answer the purpose of the dunscope's we had to our apartments in Trinity College? Was it not intended to secure the priest a pilgrim-scope, and so give him notice of all who came to keep station, or do penance at the well?!!—In the North wall on leaving the tower is a hearth and chimney, which prove that this building was intended to be a dwelling; as well as a place of worship: I know not that this chimney, or the two apartments in the Western division, have been noticed by any other writer. We now ascend a little higher, and get at the place called St. Doulough's bed; this is contained in the uppermost part of the projecting porch: the entrance is irregular, and very narrow: the space within vaulted over; the floor rough and uneven, being the upper part of the stone ceiling of the closet below. If the Saint had not a good feather-bed, or hair mattress, or

plenty of straw, Heaven help his little bones: little also, I may well say, must he have been; for I, having the proportions of a sizable man, could not recline in this bed without drawing up my knees to my nose. Into this short and narrow space, which, at the utmost is about five feet long, by two wide, and two and a-half high, light is admitted by a cruciform loop; and yet, perhaps there is not a bed in the best hotel in Dublin that has had so many fellows—if womankind may be called fellows—as this; for hither for centuries, and up to this very day, married women, who are not *enciente*, come to have the Saint's blessing to place them in that predicament; and when so circumstanced, they subsequently also lie down here to ensure a safe delivery: and surely any lady possessed of faith so strong as to carry her through the experiment, and a constitution withal so robust, and a body so pliant, as to bear the doubling up that must be indulged in this strait couch, need not fear the common casualties incident to her interesting situation. In the floor of this so-called bed is a hole, which bears the marks of a bell-rope having passed from below. If this place was intended for the rites of penance, it might also serve for the purpose of suspending one of the ancient square bells, formed of plates of sonorous brass rivetted together, and rung by a cord attached to the clapper.* The upper part of the tower contains another apartment, presenting nothing remarkable; the same irregular distribution of loop-holes is apparent; the same attention to durability; the same neglect of every thing that in our own times we would call comfort.

Having thus endeavoured to describe this extraordinary structure, which contains, in a smaller compass, more *outré* divisions, and more strange contrivances than any building I ever yet saw, or ever expect to see; and which has within its limited compass seven apartments, two staircases, and almost as many apertures for sight and light as there are days in the year.

Let me now proceed to the holy well, and the baths for baptising. And certainly of all the holy wells in Ireland, this bears the bell for original beauty of construction and regularity of arrangement; while every thing that modern neglect and modern defilement could perpetrate, short of absolute destruction, is exhibited here. The well is covered by an octangular edifice, standing in an excavated area of the same shape, the descent to which is by a flight of steps. The remaining description of this pretty place of ancient observance and devotion, I may as well give in the words of my valued but humble friend, Robert Armstrong, the schoolmaster of Raheny, whose fate it is to cut blocks with a razor, who accompanied me to St. Doulough's, and

* Mr. George Petrie, R.H.A., in my opinion the best Irish antiquarian now living, amongst his truly interesting collection of the antiquities of this Island, has one of these square bells, which, by a chain of evidence, he can prove was blessed by St. Patrick.

to whose pencil I am indebted for the drawing from which the wood cut affixed to this paper is taken. "Each side of the area of this well, measures twelve feet, and from the surface it is five feet deep; the building, like the church, is stone-roofed and vaulted; the facets fronting the cardinal points are raised to a second story, and pedimented; each pediment contains a lancet light, under which, in the lower part, is a cross-shaped loop-hole; the door is square-headed, and fronts the south: each facet of the octagon measures four feet six inches; the entire is finished and surmounted by a pyramidal cone, the top of which is wanting; and among the chinks of which an ash tree has taken root, and though at present a very picturesque accompaniment to the building, threatens, at no distant period, to displace and disjoint the stones of which it is composed.

The interior is circular, having three deep recesses, provided with stone benches, and lighted by the cruciform loops already mentioned; in the centre is the well of pure limpid water; a rim, formed like a barrel, and perfectly round, of a solid stone, five inches thick on the edge, and two feet deep, encircles it: the ceiling is groined; and in each spandril, and over each recess, is a sunk pannel: this building was formerly enriched with ornaments, as will be mentioned hereafter.

To the north of the well, a square space projects from the corresponding side of the octangular area; and contains an oblong cistern six feet long by four feet six inches in width: round three sides of this space runs a stone bench; and at the west side of the cistern are two descending steps: this, I conceive, was the baptistery, or public font, in which the recipient of the sacred rite stood; it is now nearly filled up. Still further North, detached from the area, and under the surface of the earth, is a vaulted bath, called St. Catherine's, twelve feet long, and six feet wide; the entrance from the meadow is by a flight of narrow steps, and a low arched door; there is usually two or three feet of water in it, and with care it might be made deeper and perfectly commodious as a bath—now full of stones and every thing that can be considered disagreeable and disgusting. The following description of the ornaments that formerly decorated the well is from an anonymous history of the Ecclesiastical State of Dublin, published in A. D. 1747, and quoted by Doctor Ledwich:—

"Near the church is a well of most lucid and delightful water, enclosed and arched over, and formerly embellished at the expense of Peter Fagan, brother of John Fagan, Esq., of Feltrim, with the decorations of gilding and painting. The descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles was represented on the top: the effigies of Saint Patrick, Saint Columba, and Saint Brigid, much after the manner they are engraved in Mesingham's "*Florilegium Sanctorum Hiberniæ*," as also St. Doulough in a hermit's

Habit. On the walls was the following inscription engraved on a marble stone:—

“*Piscine solymis claræ decus offerat alter
Et medicas populus jactet hebræus aquas
Grata Deo patrium celebrat Fingallæ fontem
Doulachi precibus numerata nacta piis
Morbus ille fugat promptus, verisque reponet
Ægris et causas mille salutis habet
Scilicet æquus agit mediis Doulachio in undis
Angelus et Fontem sic movet ille suum.
O Fons! nostu amor si te negleximus olim,
Mox erit ut nomen sit super astra tuum.*”

“Bethsaida's sacred pool, let others tell,
With healing virtues how her waters swell:
An equal glory shall Fingallia claim,
Nor be less grateful for her blissful stream.
Thy prayers, Doulachus, mounted up to heaven,
Thence to thy well the mighty power is given
To drive the Fiery Fever far away,
Strength to replace, and rescue from decay,
In every malady to life a stay.
The Cherub, wondrous, moves his watery sphere:
The Saint behold, who stirs the Fountain here.
Hail! lovely font, if long unsung thy name,
It hence shall rise above the starry frame!”

“Doctor Patrick Russell, Archbishop of Dublin, granted forty days indulgence to those who would say devoutly, on their bare knees, at St. Doulagh's well, five times, the Lord's Prayer, Ave Maria, and at the end of said prayers, the Apostles creed: and that a fortnight must intervene between each time of saying the aforesaid prayers, to gain the indulgence, as appears from an inscription which had been formerly on a stone, which imported the same.”

All the ornaments and inscriptions are now removed; no traces whatever remain. It is traditionally said that about eighty or ninety years since, a person of fortune named Newenham, who lived in the neighbourhood, with a set of drunken companions, defiled the well in the most filthy and indecent manner; and to finish the work of sacrilege, they broke down the iron door that secured the well; pulled down the representations of the Holy Ghost and Saints that ornamented the interior, and carried away the figures of Saints Patrick, Columba, Brigid, and Doulagh, and broke in pieces the marble tablets that contained the inscriptions. The rustics say, and believe, that the vengeance of heaven overtook the iconoclasts; that Newen-

man's daughter fell a victim to a fire, which caught her clothes, while dressing for a ball, and that he himself died a fugitive and a pauper, in want and contempt.

Until very lately, this place was yearly frequented by immense crowds of devotees, from all the surrounding country, who, assembling on the first Sunday of August, continued on that and the two following Sabbaths to perform the usual routine of superstitious rites observed at such stations, with the generally accompanying scenes of riot and disorder. Tents were erected, and the second Sunday particularly, was noticed for drunkenness and debauchery.

Such was the holy well of St. Doulough's in days of yore, and our experience, when taking a survey of this ancient place, convinced us how Popery, in its ancient spirit, in spite of the priests, who, under respect for public opinion, are forced to cast away the slough of its slavish superstitions, still lingers with the people, who yet cannot understand why the *new* priests should discountenance what the old patronized as the craft by which they got their gain.

The day on which we visited St. Doulough's was rainy and rough, and after making our inspections, we had to take shelter from a shower in a cabin, where an old crone of a woman hung smoking over the almost expiring embers of a fire of sticks, in that sad state in which the female peasantry in the neighbourhood of Dublin are placed, in the winter season, when they have nothing to do abroad, and nothing to do at home; and where, with scarcely any mode of earning food, they still, when possible, indulge in the deleterious luxuries of tea, tobacco, and whiskey. We mentioned, in terms of admiration, St. Doulough, when the woman, immediately taking the *dudeen* (Anglice, short pipe) from her mouth, broke forth into a warm and querulous descant on the virtues of the Saint; on the holiness of the well; on the virtues of the bed; on the *ould* resort of the patron, &c. &c. And concluded with a malediction, cordial to her as tea and tobacco, on the Orangemen and Peelers, and the falling away of the times. Och, then (said she,) but them were the gay and *dacent* days; when our clargy instead of looking proud, and upish (by this and by that, myself don't now understand what they're at,) but sure enough, they were betther days, any how, than now, when priest and people used to go together to our station at the well. Och, jewel dear, it would do your heart good to see uz all about it: there was the walking Sunday, and the big Sunday; many's the good match was made at them; and many's the crathur came lame and blind, and went away cured—let alone all the women that came as straight and slim as the ramrod of a Peeler's firelock, and believe you me, before that day twelvemonth it would take more nor a yard of tape to make them an apron-string. But those bloody Peelers, and the parsons, and their Bible schools, and *our own* priests, bad manners to them, put a stop to the station, and sign's on it, there's

neither luck nor grace in the place since : the gentlemen is all broke ; the poor can't get a hand's turn to do—and are starving ; and what other could we expect, when they meddled with St. Doulough's.

Certainly, if the situation of the wretched creature, and that of the family that were in the house with her, of whom she appeared to be grandmother, was an evidence of the wrath of the Saint, for his former rites being neglected, the effects were deplorable. She appeared, as Burns has it, "half mad, half fed, half sarkit ;" and of the swarm of children that paddled about the moist floor, two were humpbacked, another had a withered arm, and one appeared to be a confirmed idiot.

Let me now conclude this paper with a few remarks concerning the history of this singular structure. The general opinion is, that St. Doulough's is coeval with Cormack's Chapel on the Rock of Cashel, which is considered to have been built in the ninth century. In my humble opinion, it is not earlier than the eleventh, and that it was erected by the Danes. Poor doctor Ledwich, who certainly was at all times a sturdy, and sometimes a satisfactory and able impugner of Irish claims to *very remote* antiquity, asserts that it was not only built by these rovers, but that it was erected in honor of, and consecrated to St. Olave, whose name, by a little change of pronunciation, can be made to sound like St. Doulough. As no Irishman can speak or write concerning the antiquities of his country with temper or common sense, this assertion of Ledwich set Dr. Lanigan quite wild, and he asserts that his *roe* talks ridiculous nonsense—is not only a bungler, but a robber, in thus depriving the Irish nation of this St. Doulough. Now one might have supposed that Ireland, the Island of Saints, and which sent forth to other lands as many saints as she now sends paupers,* might have spared *one* saint to poor Denmark. But no, Dr. Ledwich is nothing but a fool. Doulach, or rather Duleck, was an Irishman, the son of Amalgad, the son of Senell ; and long before the Danes came, his memory was revered on the 17th of November, on this very spot, anciently called Clocher, on which the Church is situated. It is all nonsense, then, for Ledwich to quote Harris's History of Dublin, and assert that, because there was a St. Olave's Church at the end of Fishamble-street, vulgarly called St. Tulloch's, that therefore St. Douloch, of Fingal, was St. Olave, worshipped under a similar corruption of name.

Now, for my part, caring little whether this structure was

* I think I have somewhere read in the Irish annals, as given by O'Connor in his "*Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores*," that, in the 7th or 8th century, the heads of the English monasteries complained bitterly of the number of Irish Bishops that came over, poor and penniless, seeking sees in Britain, or from thence passing over to the Continent to find a birth. Some venerable "*Scrope*" uttered his complaint concerning these dignified paupers in no measured terms.

built in honour of Olave the Dane, or Duleck the Milesian, I am quite convinced that it is a building of the 11th century, and was erected by the Danes, when they were in possession of Fingal, and not long after they were converted to Christianity. It is more than probable that they found the fine well here flowing clear and wholesome out of the limestone rock, and perhaps by the natives used for baptism, holy sprinklings, and other ritual ablutions; and it was made choice of by their teachers, who perhaps were Irishmen, as a public missionary station. The manners of this people being warlike, their government unsettled, their footing in the island precarious, it was thought advisable to make their buildings answer more purposes than one; and therefore they would be induced to erect, as is here, a church, a watch-tower, a place capable of defence, a dwelling for missionaries, and a penitentiary for the pilgrim frequenters of the holy well; accordingly we find it erected on a lofty eminence that commanded an extensive prospect over land and sea. It also, from its thick walls, its low doors, stone roofs, and central battlemented tower, was capable of being defended; and its chimnies, its various rooms and other accommodations, not necessary here to mention, together with a secret passage, which is supposed to lead to the well, made it a place where ecclesiastics could securely reside; and as the church part of it was originally too small for the accommodation of a congregation, they enlarged its dimensions, by adding the porch, and by making provision on the northern side, by means of an arch, for a future enlargement in that direction. As they were no great architects, they followed no particular plan, but laid on one stone after another as fancy led, or after-thought dictated; in order to preserve the original crypt, and perhaps to create some degree of external uniformity, they cased it over with squared stone, to correspond with the new erection. From the circumstance of the hatch door over the altar, it is probable the officiating priest, with the most fervent of the worshippers, or perhaps the communicants, stood in the western division, as the most holy, while the bulk of the congregation filled the eastern end, and had a view of the clergyman through the aperture. Indeed, from all the arrangements, the place seems to have been erected in the infancy of a Christian church, just springing up among a rude and adult population, the ceremonies of which church were tinctured with some of the observances of Popery. The open baptistery, the holy well, the small dungeon-like apartments, the penitentiary or bed of affliction, the covered bath for ablution and washing away the filth of iniquity, and, finally, the open pulpit from whence to address the multitude, and the division between the catechumens and the communicants, by which the former were prevented from any participation, beyond an occasional view, in the divine mysteries, all tend to prove it to be erected, or at least re-edified, by the Danes, just emerging from Paganism, but still only changing one superstition for another. The peculiarities of the structure may also be adduced as corroborative of this opinion; the

flows, so profusely introduced, are all different in design; no two are alike; even sometimes the parts of the same window do not correspond. And who were so likely as the piratical Danes, who not only plundered and destroyed almost all the churches of the nation, but preyed on every coast, to take the patterns of different edifices, and attempt here trying their *prentice hand* at ecclesiastical architecture, to imitate many, and so make such a confused mixture of parts as go to the construction of St. Doulough. It may be, that seeing in Ireland, or on some other coast which they visited, some large structure which struck their fancy, they attempted here this diminutive and absurd imitation, and had such success as I may suppose the worthy Irish builder will have who, when last I was in Cambrige, was taking drawings of that finest perhaps of all Gothic buildings in the world, King Henry the Seventh's Chapel at Cambridge, in order to erect a Popish Chapel on the same model in the good town of Dundalk.

C. O.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
AND
Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXIX.

MARCH, 1834.

Vol. III.

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE LAW OF LIBEL.*

WE are not lawyers, nor is our Magazine a proper place for disquisitions upon legal subjects; and did we consider the pamphlet before us strictly a legal one, we should consider ourselves as stepping out of our line and beyond our measure in attempting to review it; but we consider it as having a bearing upon religion much more than upon law; and whilst it professes to be an attack upon the law as it now stands as to one particular subject, we consider it much more as, however unintentionally, an attack upon religion. We admit with much readiness the talent which this little production exhibits, and the powers of mind which its author manifests; but we cannot but lament that those talents and powers should be, as they appear to us, so sadly misapplied. That we may not spend too much time upon preliminary observations, we would at once say, that we consider the argument it contains to be but a specious sophism, and the religion which it holds forth but a sort of sceptical deism. These are serious charges; we hasten to our proofs, and we would begin with the last first.

But it will be necessary to state the complaint which the author makes against the law of libel, as it now exists, relating to publications on the subject of religion. The complaint will be found in the very first sentence of the pamphlet:—

“By the existing law of the land, so far as relates to the publication of religious opinions, any writing whatever which shall tend to impeach the evidences of the Christian faith, or in any manner to impugn Christianity as a whole, is, I believe, indictable as a blasphemous libel, and punishable as such by fine and imprisonment, or other infamous corporal punishment.”

* Considerations on the Law of Libel, as relating to the subject of Religion. By John Search. London: James Ridgway, Picadilly. 1833.

This is the author's complaint, that men are not allowed to impugn with impunity the evidences of the Christian faith, or Christianity as a whole. "The advised attempt to dispute the truth of Scripture is itself a legal crime." Against this the author raises his voice and employs all his powers. He goes on to state many objections to this, which he calls uncalled for severity, and in page 4, we find him thus speaking:—

"That the religious inquirer, who, without a thought or feeling of irreverence to God or religion, as such, or a single word of intentional insult to the institutions of his country, seeks only by fair investigation to try the certainty of the things wherein he has been instructed, should hereby be subjected to penalties thus severe, does seem harsh, be his conclusions never so faulty, (and even of *that* who is to be the competent *arbiter*?) It does seem harsh to make him liable to penalties thus severe and thus infamous for submitting to public judgment the grounds of his own distrust of certain human statements and human testimony, on subjects confessedly of the nearest import to himself and all mankind; for alleging, in the way of argument, that he has just grounds for doubt, not of the existence, not of the goodness, the wisdom, the mercy, or the overruling providence of God, nor of the obligation of human duties, and future responsibility of man, but simply of the veracity of certain human statements respecting facts affirmed to have taken place in a distant country many ages ago."

We cannot help, when we read this, asking, can the writer be a Christian? Can he be a believer in the inspiration of the Scriptures? If he is a believer in the Divine authority of the Scriptures, has he not, in his zeal for his argument, forgotten the language of a Christian? Is it consistent with Christian faith to call the assertions of Holy Scripture "human statements" and "human testimony?"—"human statements respecting facts affirmed to have taken place in a distant country many ages ago." Could the veriest sceptic have used language more derogatory to the authority of the Sacred Records? Is this in the spirit in which Peter spoke, in his day, of Holy Scripture: "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," "which the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, spake before concerning Judas." (Acts, i. 16.) He would not have called the assertions of the penman of Revelation "human statements"—"human testimony."

The author makes a distinction between natural and revealed religion, which we cannot see that any believer in Revelation could consistently make. He appears, in the paragraphs quoted, to admit that it might be right to restrain men from publishing doubts as to "the existence, the goodness, the wisdom, the mercy, the overruling providence of God, or of the obligation of human duties and future responsibility of man;" whilst his whole object in his pamphlet is to deny the right to restrain men from expressing their doubts of the truth of the Divine Revelation.

Whence comes, we would ask, this distinction in his mind between natural and revealed religion? Is not this a distinction that we might expect from a deist, but for which we cannot account in a Christian—in one who assents to that saying of St. Paul, 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10, “Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him; but God hath revealed them unto us by his spirit,”—in one who understands that saying of a greater than Paul, “No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him?” (Mat. xi. 27.)

Our author in different places lays much stress, and assumes much in favour of his own side of the question, from, as he expresses himself, “*shyness of speaking out* on this subject which is observable in judges and other lawyers.” We think we detect the same *shyness* of speaking out in our author himself. He does not speak out, and say boldly that he would allow a man to deny the existence, the goodness, the wisdom, the mercy, the overruling providence of God, or the obligation of human duties and future responsibility of man; neither does he speak out and admit that here he would desire no change in the law, but that he would continue to restrain men from this particular excess of impiety. We see much shyness in our author in this respect; but though he does not speak out, yet from the distinction he makes in the extract we have alluded to, and in other places, we gather that he would still restrain by law all attacks upon the existence, wisdom, goodness, mercy of God, &c.

We say, if this was not his view of the question, why did he not speak out? In page 50, he says—

“The only perfectly good plan, fair in itself and consistent with the true honour of *revealed religion*, would be to tolerate an unlimited discussion of the grounds whereon we receive it.”

Why does he speak here only of revealed religion; unless that as to natural religion he would not tolerate an unlimited discussion of the grounds whereon we receive it? But if he would not tolerate an unlimited discussion as to natural religion—as to the existence, goodness, wisdom, mercy, &c. of God, does he not give up the very principle for the support of which his whole pamphlet is written? Does he not admit that there is a certain point beyond which, in any well ordered society, toleration of discussion cannot be allowed. He admits the principle of restraint, but whilst he admits it to be applicable to the subject of natural religion, he denies that it is applicable to revealed religion, and he appears to found this distinction between natural and revealed religion upon some deficiency of Divine testimony and authority, which he speaks of as existing in the case of revealed religion. His pamphlet, then, is not to be considered as an argument in

support of a principle of free discussion capable of universal application, but an attempt to show that the opposite principle, admitted to be correct, should not be applied as extensively as it has been; that the principle of restraint should not be applied to revealed religion, because revealed religion, not having as much Divine authority and testimony as natural religion, should be exposed to discussion in a way in which natural religion should not. The author's view of the subject appears to have arisen from an unfavourable comparison in his mind between natural and revealed religion, and therefore it is no matter of surprise, though of grief and pain to us, to find many passages in the pamphlet, if not bespeaking the scepticism of the author's mind, too much calculated to justify, if not to beget, doubt and uncertainty in others.

"In saying that the truth of Scripture is matter of *opinion*, I conceive that I am not speaking in disparagement of the strength of its evidences, but simply stating that which arises from necessity of the case. Strictly speaking, all *matters of fact* whatever, as resting by necessity on moral evidence only, must be, to all but those personally cognizant of them, in some degree *matters of opinion*. And although in numberless cases the *degree* of such uncertainty may be infinitely small, (as when, *e. g.* we assume, on general authority, that there is such a city as Constantinople, or such a continent as America;) yet this is generally in the case of facts either wholly uncontradicted, or nearly so. But in the case of the Gospel facts, the solemn denial of their truth by the major half of the Jewish nation in the first instance, and by their posterity ever since, forms a body of counter-testimony which cannot, by any commonly candid reasoner, be deemed *entirely* without weight, and must at least effectually make an *opening* for honest diversity of opinion.—And hence I cannot but regard as highly injudicious, that over-strained language often adopted in regard to the Gospel evidences, which would describe them as placing its truth utterly beyond the reach of honest doubt, and would teach us to recoil in horror from the bare idea of such doubt existing for a moment, unexpelled, in our own minds. For since no man of common reflection *can* take the subject in hand without being conscious to himself of *some* modification of doubt, which yet, perhaps, he might eventually—not repress, not stifle, from a factitious principle of duty—but happily surmount by diligent inquiry; *that* cannot, surely, be a wise policy which teaches the man so circumstanced that he *already* stands committed in impiety, and has *already* passed the *Rubicon* of hostility to the Gospel. At all events—with respect to the law of the case—if assurance in this matter can never amount strictly to *knowledge*, is it just to punish a man for professing disbelief of that which no man can *know* to be true?"

We confess ourselves to have been much pained during the reading of the paragraph just quoted—to have been filled with amazement and sorrow that a professing Christian should

labour to prove that that God who has given us his revealed Gospel, and has commanded it to be preached to every creature, adding, that "*he that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned,*" has failed in so recommending it to the acceptance of man, as not to have placed its truth beyond the reach of *honest doubt*. We have been grieved and pained that when the Apostle had told us of the Israelites who could not enter into the rest of God because of unbelief, and has after this example warned us against an evil heart of unbelief, a professedly Christian author should tell us of "a body of counter testimony, which cannot by any commonly candid reasoner be deemed entirely without weight, and must at least effectually make an opening for honest diversity of opinion." So then, according to this author, amongst those to whom the Gospel is propounded there can be an honest diversity of opinion whether (what Paul calls a "faithful saying worthy of all acceptance") "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners;" "there is salvation in no other, there is no other name given under heaven among men whereby they may be saved." Must we not be grieved at such a sentence as that with which the paragraph concludes: "If assurance in this matter can never amount strictly to *knowledge*, is it just to punish a man for professing disbelief of that which no man can know to be true?" What a fearful saying—no man can know the religion of Christ to be true!! We cannot but pity the man that wrote this; he certainly does not know the religion of Christ to be true. To what end, in this case, did the Saviour say, "This is eternal life, to *know* thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent?" Was Paul a boaster and a hypocrite when he said, "*I know* whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day?" (2 Tim. i. 12.) And let it be remarked that it is upon this deistical view of the subject that our author puts a distinction between natural and revealed religion; and whilst he would admit the propriety of restraining those who would deny the existence, goodness, wisdom, &c. of God, he would tolerate free discussion as to the revelation of Christ. It is not that he advocates a toleration of free discussion on religion generally, but he cries out against the restriction imposed on free discussion with regard to Christianity, because, as he says, with regard to it there may be an honest diversity of opinion.

We are perfectly sincere when we declare that we have felt much pain at the manifestation of such low views of the Christian Revelation as abound in this pamphlet, and this is the principle feature which has induced us to make any remarks on it; but (which is indeed a matter of much less importance) we think its logic and reasoning as defective as its religion is erroneous. There is much subtlety, much ingenuity, but much inconclusive reasoning. For example, before we proceed to examine the great thread of argument that runs through the work, let us look for a moment to the last sentence in the paragraph already quoted. We have

protested against its theology—let us examine its reasoning: “At all events, with respect to the law of the case, if assurance in this matter can never amount strictly to knowledge, is it just to punish a man for professing disbelief of that which no man can know to be true?” The proposition put forward in this question is this—In any case where assurance cannot amount to knowledge, it is unjust to punish a man for professing his disbelief.

Let us try this principle in another case. The assurance with which any inhabitant of this country can receive the fact that William IV. is the son of George III., and therefore rightful King of the United Kingdom of England and Ireland, cannot amount strictly to knowledge; therefore it would be unjust to punish a man for professing his disbelief that William IV. is the lawful King of these realms. We would ask is this a good argument? If a man was tried on a charge of treason for endeavouring to turn men from their allegiance to the King, would it be a valid plea in his defence that assurance in this matter never could with him amount to knowledge, and therefore he had a right to lead all other people to refuse him allegiance as King? If, then, his assurance, not amounting to knowledge, is no warrant for freedom of discussion in the case of an earthly king, why must it be in the case of the King of Kings and Lord of Lords? We cannot help thinking that in the statement of uncertainty necessarily attached to our belief of the Revelation of Jesus Christ, there is very false religion; but (even were the fact admitted for argument's sake) it is very bad logic to conclude from thence that it is unjust to restrain a man from endeavouring to turn others from the faith. The reasons which may make it fit that law should restrain a man from insulting one Being and injuring many others may be, and indeed must be, drawn from something very different than the degrees of his knowledge or his ignorance.

But it is not only here and there that we find, under much that is clever and specious, very unsound reasoning and much sophistical argument; we find it in the main branch of the argument which runs through the work. The principal assertion which lawyers have made to prove the right, nay, the necessity of restraining men from impugning the Christian Revelation is that *Christianity is part and parcel of the law*; and against this our author directs the chief force of his argumentative powers; and in his treatment of this question lies, as we conceive, the whole fallacy of his work. He throughout confounds the *subject matter* of legislation with *the law itself*. The lawyers have asserted that Christianity is the law of the land, incorporated with, and part and parcel of, the common law of the realm. He confounds with it the assertion that Christianity has been established by the law, and has become the subject of legislation by the law. We must let the author speak on this subject for himself:—

“The foregoing remarks will also apply, for the most part, to the great and mystic dictum that Christianity is ‘*part and parcel of the law*.’”

which is only the plea of '*Establishment*' in another and still obscurer shape, and labouring under the same defect—viz: that of studiously excluding the *special* consideration which alone could make it pertinent.

"The deficiency of the argument is, however, in this case better veiled by the greater ambiguity of diction. The term 'part and parcel' is deceitful; it cheats us with the semblance of a meaning, having none in reality. When we are told, 'The Christian religion is *established*,' we have at least a proposition with a meaning, and therefore some means of judging whether or not a given inference from it be a just one. But the assertion that it is 'part and parcel,' &c. having no determinate sense, one inference from it is near about as good as another; nor can the puzzled hearer say with certainty of *any one* that it is not fairly deducible; but, hearing it authoritatively propounded, is led to suppose there is a meaning, and a connection, though *he* cannot perceive it.

"The Christian religion, in common with sundry things of meaner sort, has been a *subject-matter* of legislation: and the existing LAWS upon that subject, whether derived from statute or precedent, form collectively a part or parcel of the general body of our laws,—in other words, a part or parcel of *the law*. In like manner hares and pheasants have been a *subject-matter* of legislation; and the existing enactments on *that* subject are *also* part or parcel of the law of England. Whether, or under what restrictions, the evidences of Christianity may be discussed, or a hare or pheasant shot, are questions which can be solved by one test only, viz: by reference specifically to the said laws so existing on either subject: but to say summarily of the Christian religion, that its truth must not be questioned, because it (*the Christian religion*) is *part of the law of the land*,—is, I allege, an abuse of terms precisely similar to that of saying that hares and pheasants must not, in such and such cases, be shot at, because they (hares and pheasants) are part of the law of England. In each case alike you confound the idea of a *subject-matter* of legislation with that of the *law or laws* which may exist thereon."

Whilst every serious mind must be hurt at the irreverence and bad taste exhibited in this comparison between Christianity and "hares and pheasants," every thinking mind will be struck by the sophistry that pervades the reasoning. When Judge Hale said that "Christianity is part of the law of England, and therefore to reproach the Christian religion is to speak in subversion of the law," it is evident he never meant to say that Christianity was the subject matter of legislation, just as hares and pheasants are the subject matter of legislation; and therefore it is a flagrant sophism to impute to his saying in the one sense an absurdity which would only belong to it in the sense in which he did not say it. Judge Hale never said that to reproach Christianity was to speak in subversion of the law, because the law had passed enactments in favour of Christianity; but Judge Hale said that Christianity was an integral part of that common law of the land from the authority of which enactments derived their force. In

Judge Hale's view, the Divine law of God, as we have it in the Christian Revelation, was the original anterior foundation of the common law of England; and therefore he that impugned the Christian Revelation impugned the very foundation of the law of the land.

Our author says, you may impugn Christianity, which is the subject matter of legislation, because you may impugn the wisdom of any enactment, though you may not set at nought the authority of the law that makes the enactment. Judge Hale says, you may not impugn Christianity, because it is the foundation on which the law rests; and you may not upset all law, by taking from it that from which it derives all its authority.

The whole fallacy of John Search, from beginning to the end, is laid open when we keep before us this distinction, which he studiously confounds. One short paragraph will lay it open to the mind of the reader; we give his own words:—

“We have in this procedure no bad specimen of the capabilities of the common law to be wrought by a competent artist into any required form. We have a series of learned authorities, from Hale and Raymond downwards, professing to extract the legality of coercing discussion on Christianity out of the bare fact of its being *established* as the State religion. I speak not here of the Statute, nor of the precedents which they may or might have cited for this end, but of their preferring to offer as an independent and self-sufficient ground for such coercion, the single fact of Christianity being ‘*established*,’ or, as they more love to phrase it, a ‘part and parcel of the law.’—(p. 21-2.)

Now, we would ask, was ever Jesuit guilty of more sophistry than is exhibited in this paragraph? Could this acute author have been so blind as not to have seen the distinction between the ideas which he here confounds, or was he so dishonest as to see the difference clearly, and yet confound them for the sake of his argument? What! is there no difference between Christianity as the foundation of all human law, and a form of Christian doctrine and worship established in the land? The author knows there is immense difference. That form which is established was never called by any person, before John Search, “part and parcel of the law;” and so, in fact, there is no restraint put upon the discussion of the merit or demerit of that form of doctrine or worship which is established by law; whilst there is restraint upon the discussion of that Christianity which, so far from being established by law, gives to the law its authority and its sanction. Judge Hale never sought to coerce discussion on Christianity on account of what the law had done for Christianity, but on account of what Christianity does for the law—not because Christianity is the child of the law, but because it is the parent of the law. And this principle is acted upon in other things as well as religion. No judge would permit the King's authority to be called in question; not because the King's

authority is, in many respects, the subject-matter of legislation, but because it is the foundation of the law—because the King's right is part and parcel of the law.

It is the aim of the author throughout to confound these two distinct ideas, the *law* and the subject-matter of the law; he does it most especially in a note in p. 21:—

“ See a like equivocation in another phrase occasionally resorted to in working the *dictum*. Christianity, it is said, is ‘ the law,’ or ‘ part of the law,’ &c., and therefore ‘ must be protected as the law.’ So Lord Ellenborough, in *Eaton’s case*, refers to the doctrines of Hale, Raymond, and Kenyon (*State Trials*, xxxi. 950;) and in reference to that of Williams; Mr. (now Judge) Bayley cites Lord Raymond in much the same form. ‘ Must be protected as the law!’ How moderate, how reasonable does this sound! to be ‘ protected,’ just as *any other* ‘ part’ or ‘ parcel’ of the law is ‘ protected.’ Yet how different the demand in reality! Other laws ask only ‘ protection’ from *infringement*; this from *criticism*; nay more, from *constructive, undesigned, involuntary criticism*; from criticism, not of it, the law, but of the *subject-matter* to which the law relates!”

Was there ever more sophistry in any piece of writing? The Judge says, Christianity must be protected as the law; our author argues upon it as if he had said it must be protected as any other enactment of the law; and thus he would prove an “equivocation,” because other laws ask only protection from *infringement*—this from *criticism*, &c.; and yet, in the very last sentence, he himself shows that he is perfectly aware of, and has clearly before his mind, the distinction, whilst he falsifies the fact: “From criticism, not of it, *the law*, but of the *subject-matter* to which the law relates!” The Judge plainly says the very opposite of what our author attributes to him; he would protect from criticism and reproach the *law* and *not* the *subject-matter* of the law. Let but this point be considered, and the sophistry of John Search will be at once detected. His whole argument is, that Christianity, as the subject-matter of the law, should not be protected more than any other subject-matter of the law; whereas the fact is, that Christianity is protected from attack and reproach as being the *law* itself. “By it kings reign and princes decree justice.” It cries aloud, “Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God,” &c.

We cannot say that we are sanguine in our expectation that the sentiments in this pamphlet will not become more generally received than they are now; on the contrary, we see the general feeling of the country moving fast towards infidelity and atheism. We see the infidel spirit which has long been the curse, the demoralizer of France, gaining ground in these countries. We see nothing to give us an assurance that Great Britain and Ireland will not, ere long, be as free from the wholesome restraints of religion as France has long been; when it will be as lawful to

revile and reproach Christianity generally as to contend against particular opinions connected with it. But whilst we cannot say that we are sanguine in our expectations, we are very earnest and sincere in our desires that the sentiments of this pamphlet may not gain ground in our country. They are connected with degrading views of Christianity; low views of the evidences as compared with natural religion; and low views of its position as connected with human laws. No man who admits the propriety (as our author does, though he is *shy to speak out*;) of restraining men from denying the existence, wisdom, and mercy of God the Creator, would sanction the denial of the existence, the wisdom, and mercy of God the Redeemer, if he believed that "no man could come to the Father, but through the Son," and that every man should "honour the Son even as he honours the Father."

No man can take the part which our author has done, without setting up deism, whilst he is willing to cry down atheism, without becoming the apologist of those who deny the testimony of God's word—whilst he is willing to join in just indignation against those who deny the testimony of God's works. John Search is, in fact, such an apologist for deism. We find a long note, page 69, which is an apology for deism, in which a professing Christian—one who professes himself to believe the Scriptures, which we profess to be as much God's work as the heavens above are God's work—gives reasons to justify a man in denying God's hand in the one, whilst he acknowledges God's hand in the other. But we confess we cannot make the distinction. We believe Redemption to be as glorious a work of God as Creation; and as the things that are seen declare the glory of God as Creator, so the revealed Word declares the grace of God as Redeemer. We believe the stamp of the Divine Author to be as visibly fixed upon the one as upon the other, and it is the same evil heart of unbelief that rejects the testimony of the *Word* or the testimony of the *Works*. "He that despiseth me," said he, "despiseth him that sent me." "He is alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in him, on account of the blindness of his heart."

ON THE CHILDREN OF RELIGIOUS PARENTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

(Continued from page 107.)

SIR—Another disadvantage in the case we are now considering is, that children accustomed to religion, without embracing it, (and of such alone I speak,) lose thereby much of the salutary influence of fear; without receiving in its place the higher principle of love. In many worldly families, religion is treated with a formal and respectful distance; it is excluded from all familiar access; it is spoken of as suitable only to sacred times and places; and if it is banished wholly from free and cheerful conversation, this exclusion is defended on the principle that religion is too high and holy a thing to be profaned by such associations. The lessons of the children are precisely of a piece with the habits of the family. They are taught to view religion from an awful distance; into its meaning or its nature it is not for them to enquire. If a clergyman visits at the house, they are to look on him as an example of religion, because he is a clergyman. If they are taken to church, they are forbidden to make remarks on the sermon, because all sermons are equally good. If their parents absent themselves from the sacrament, the children learn that it is for fear too frequent a repetition might diminish its awful impressions on the mind. In such a system, however low, lessons may be learned which are convertible to future good. A principle (not the highest, but still a principle,) is engrafted. Something is genuinely felt; and even this fear may be the beginning of wisdom.

But the child of religious parents who does not yield his own heart to God, and heal, as the medical phrase is, at the first intention, is in these respects unhappily circumstanced. Lower impressions cannot reach his mind, and higher ones he has not. Religion is to him neither a stranger nor a friend. The parent, even if so inclined, cannot hold religion at a distance from his child; nor can the latter feel that vague and superstitious awe of things which are continually before him, and domesticated with him. In the society where his lot is cast, he hears the characters of clergymen, though charitably, yet freely discussed. He hears the comparative merits of sermons canvassed with equal liberty. He hears that no means of grace, not even sacraments themselves, possess any magic charm, and that they have no intrinsic value, but what they derive from that God who is about his path and about his bed, and in whom he lives, and moves, and has his being. The effect of all this must be to disrobe religion of that solemn mystery in which it arrays itself to the eyes of distant gazers. It is too near to be indistinct, and too familiar to be viewed with fear. If, then, it be not affectionately embraced, the

danger is that familiarity will breed, if not contempt, at least indifference. Mr. Cecil, in his "Remains," wisely observes that "erroneous opinions may less predispose the mind against the truth of God in its lively power on the soul, than true notions, destitute of all life and influence, may do." There must be a suitability of the subject to the religion taught, or, however high the principle, it will fail of its effect; and therefore the child who does not love religion, is out of his element where religion is loved. The system in which he necessarily lives is too refined to act upon his feelings; and thus he is in danger of growing up without any sensibility towards religion at all. The light in which he is placed excludes those low impressions, which, though false and servile, are better than none; and thus that "which should have been for his good, becomes an occasion of his falling" into a state of cold and lifeless apathy.

I have ventured on these observations, my conscience bears me witness, not as a curious speculation, but as a painful duty. It may be, as I before suggested, some comfort to parents who have been disappointed in their children, to see that the real difficulties of the case were of necessity greater than they were before aware of; that their children, if they have failed to meet their wishes, have not the guilt at least of sinning against more unmixed advantages than they actually possessed; and that they themselves are not chargeable, under this heavy affliction, with more abuse of peculiar mercies than a fair review of all circumstances can warrant. No. Let such parents rather apply to their own case the exhortation of St. Peter, "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing had happened unto you." Let them remember also the assurance of St. Paul, "There hath no temptation taken you but what is common to man." The above remarks may moreover meet the eye of pious parents who fall into an error, which I have sometimes witnessed myself with much concern, namely, that of setting out in married life with too confident an expectation that, however others may have found it, to them the task of religious training will be easy and successful. Such parents resolve all failures in this respect into mere mismanagement. Various instances of the kind have attracted their observation. They have determined to profit by the miscarriages of others; and think that with an open field to act on, they can avoid them all. Such sanguine confidence I have often seen, and reflected with pain on the lessons which a sad experience might teach.

The main object of pointing out the difficulties which await the religious parent, should be, however, to direct attention to the best means of obviating or removing them. But as, in every instance, prevention is better than cure, I shall, commence this part of my subject with that which, if once accomplished, renders the parent's yoke easy, and his burthen light. All the disadvantages of which I have spoken apply to the circumstances of children who do not yield themselves, from the first, to the

blessed influences of religion. It follows, therefore, that if this point could be gained, the whole evil would be prevented. Nay, the very things which form the difficulties of less happy cases, would, in the instance of such children, become at once facilities, aids, and blessings. On this account, as well as every other, the early engagement of the heart, the introduction of children at the very dawn of life, to the knowledge and to the love of God, is important beyond all calculation. At this impressive period it is to be decided whether the parent's future task shall be the most embarrassing, or the most delightful which can fall to man. Now is to be formed that subject on which so many of his labours are to be expended. Now, in a word, is to be determined, whether it shall be his to dress and keep a domestic paradise, or to strive, in the sweat of his brow, upon a stubborn and ungrateful soil. And surely it would be well to paint in the sternest colouring the trials which await the anxious parent amidst children who are aliens from the life of God, if it could induce even one such parent, who has still the power, to improve the golden days of infancy. I do not take upon me to say precisely how soon religious impressions can be made. But sure I am, that this all-important work should begin much earlier than it usually does. Hence that parent is doubly blessed whose religion is of such a kind as can be communicated and made interesting to children. A religion of mere strictness can never win the youthful heart. A system of doctrines addresses itself to reason, and must wait till that faculty is developed. But the pure principle of love can, even in early infancy, begin its blessed work upon the soul. Yes, that religion which bears the image of its author, can, like him, take the little children into its arms, and bless them. Its soft influences can descend from the parent to the child, like dew upon the tender herb, and rain upon the grass. True religion is distinguished from all mere pretenders to the name in its power of adaptation to every age, and every variety of man: and while it is the light of matured intelligence, the refuge of the soul from all its guilty fears, and its anchor amidst the storms of life, it is to the child a holy atmosphere, in which he inhales, insensibly and unconsciously, the breath of life. Let it, then, be the parent's care that those little ones committed to his trust shall breathe this vital air. Let no harsh sounds of discord reach those ears; no looks of gloom or levity meet those eyes, which are, from the earliest infancy, taking in the elements of future character—that character on which the happiness of both child and parent must so materially depend. Instead of speculating how soon impressions may be received, let each parent so dispose and order the state of surrounding influences, that when the first door of admission opens, good, and not evil, may enter in. Let him do by his child as he would do if he watched him while sleeping, in a critical and perilous disease. In this case he would exclude all objects of alarm; he would not suffer them to

approach, because he knew not the precise moment at which his child might waken. No: in a matter of such importance he would run no risks. His care would be so to anticipate that moment, that none but soothing scenes of peace could by possibility meet his opening eyes.

If a child is early brought up to God, then, I repeat it, all the difficulties and trials which have been spoken of are happily prevented. But, alas! with many parents this seed-time is already past: with others, however faithfully they may do their own part, a thousand interferences may mar the process; and, besides, the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong. How, then, are parents to act when the poison has begun to work, and when their children are more or less indisposed to those lessons which it is their anxious desire to teach them?

I would say, in the first place, "Is any man thus afflicted? Let him pray." Let him turn his anxieties into prayer. If perplexing thoughts arise in his heart, let him spread them before the Lord, and tell out his whole case in those ears which are ever open to the earnest and humble suppliant; and assuredly if God be, as he has declared himself, a God who heareth prayer, that of a parent for his children will not be despised. The peculiar difficulties of the religious parent are, be it remembered, all connected with his fidelity towards God. And is not this a strong case to lay before a throne of mercy? Is not this an affecting appeal to make and to bring home to the compassionate heart of God? "We have not," St. Paul assures us, "an High Priest which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." And assuredly, to none can this Divine sympathy more suitably apply than to parents spiritually bereaved of their children. None can feel with deeper consolation that they can address their supplications to one who experimentally knows their sorrows, and is acquainted with their grief. With what confidence can they appeal to that Being, who thus himself complains, "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me;" and who, with all a parent's tenderness, wept over Jerusalem, saying, "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!" I am persuaded that in no instance is a man made more conformable to the sufferings of Christ than when tried by his children, in the concerns of their salvation. He has been, in a certain sense, the author of their being. It is instinctive in his nature to seek in them the image of himself; and to save their souls, "peradventure he would even dare to die." And shall not these considerations, when moulded into prayer, prevail with him who recognises in them all the faint resemblance of his own compassions? We all know the answer which was returned by a pious bishop, to the mother of Augustin. They stand on record for the consolation of pious parents. But it needs no such record to

be assured that it is the ordinary, if not the invariable course of Providence, that the child of many tears and prayers will not eventually be cast away.

But, we must live to God, if we would pray to him with acceptance. And in no case is the necessity of such living more imperious than in that of a parent, under the trying circumstances which have been described. If he would effectually recommend religion to his children, he must do justice to his own cause, and manifest, by the effects upon his own character and temper, that he invites them to no mean or unprofitable service, but to one in which it would be their honor and their happiness to engage.

Where our own family is the field on which we are called to fight the good fight of faith; where the souls of our own children are the prize for which we are contending; and where defeat or victory is the greatest blessing or the greatest curse, which, next to the loss or salvation of our own souls, can fall to the lot of man, in such a contest there should be no slumbering upon our post. The interests are too dear, the responsibilities are too awful to admit of trifling, despondency, or delay. Let the parent try his sincerity by this. Will he, for his children's sake, as well as for his own, lay aside every weight, and the sin that doth so easily beset him? Will he put on the whole armour of God? Will he faithfully make the trial what religion can effect, when it has fair play, and shines forth in all its native loveliness, clothed in the image, and impregnated with the power of God? I am convinced that many good parents lose much ground by yielding to their own infirmities; by meeting their children's faults with gloomy depression, or harassing and goading them on to what is right, with restless and unavailing impatience. But surely the Christian's calling is not thus to yield to trials, but to conquer them—not to be overcome of evil, but to overcome evil with good. I know that many may call these hard sayings, and complain of them as severe requirements. My answer is, that they are the sayings and requirements, not of man, but of God. Nor are they severe and hard, but full of every animating motive to those that hear them rightly. If, indeed, any parent can stand forth and say, that he has done all that could be done; that patience has had her perfect work; that his light has shone before his children with a brightness incapable of increase, and that all has failed—then indeed, a case is made out to which these observations do not apply. But no man, religiously in his senses, will bear this testimony to himself. If, then, success has not hitherto attended upon a parent's efforts, surely no suggestion can be more welcome or more cheering than that the remedy may be in his own power. Something, it is clear, obstructs him in his endeavours. If the impediment be wholly in others, he must submit; because the minds of others he cannot control. But if it be in himself, he then has traced it to a quarter, where, by the grace of God assisting,

his efforts to remove it must be successful. And what are the efforts which the case demands? Is it to make some painful sacrifice for his children? Is it to surrender, for their sakes, any thing worth retaining? No. It is only to draw nigh unto God, that God may, in all his difficulties, draw nigh unto him. It is only to come closer to the source and fountain of all true happiness. It is only to take higher ground than he had done before, that he may try with what new power the blessed influences of religion may descend from that commanding level upon the hearts of his children. And here I would introduce a general observation, which I wrote down at the time it occurred to me, and which I now copy in the same words.

“One great motive for Christians aiming at the utmost perfection attainable is, that nothing short of this is intelligible to the world. Till the Christian character is completed, none but an enlightened eye can understand its meaning or its excellence. It is so in many other designs and undertakings. However promising the preparations, or admirable the materials, yet till the work is finished, the ignorant can see no use or beauty in it. In painting, in statuary, in the construction of any complicated machine, no one can discern the skill of the artist at the commencement, or during the progress of the design, but he who is himself instructed in the art. But when the machine is put together, or when the last finishing is given to the portrait, or the statue, then all can, in some degree, recognize a master’s hand. Thus it is with the Christian character. None but the initiated can discern the grace that is in operation while the struggling penitent laments his miseries, and groans under the load which presses down his soul. These may be working out his full redemption; but these rude materials and early promises of a better life, are wholly lost upon the world. They know nothing of the process; it is only when the work is done, and when the man of God is perfect, that the whole world can see that the righteous is more excellent than his neighbour.”

The last particular which I shall notice is one into which none, perhaps, but he who knows the deep anxieties of a parent can fully enter. If, then, we would desire to act effectually upon the minds of our children, we must seek, and so earnestly seek as to find, our supreme happiness in God. When parents and children are not agreed upon the one great point, the state in which they live must be, more or less, a state of contest. They may be ever so strictly united in the bonds of natural affection, but, on the main subject, they are at issue. And hence there will be constantly going on a kind of trial of moral strength; each endeavouring, though often unconsciously, to draw the other to his side. In this militant condition (for such in spiritual matters it truly is) nothing, I am convinced, so weakens the parent’s moral influence, as depending too much on

his children for happiness. If he does so, he is in their power; and though they might abhor even the thought of any direct intention to abuse this power, yet they may do insensibly—at least they will feel that they possess it—and the effect of this cannot be otherwise than disadvantageous to the parent's influence, and to the cause which he upholds. No man can have effectual power over those on whom he is dependent. Nor can any man possess moral force or energy, who is not happy. If, then, the parent has no resource but in his children; if, without their sympathy he sinks and droops, he must either strike to them, and come down to their religious level, or revolt them from a religion which appears in their eyes thus spiritless and unsupported.

On the other hand, if the parent manifests that he has a resource independent of his children, and that, dearly as he loves them, God is his first object, and not they; there is a principle in human nature which will draw them close to him, precisely in proportion as they perceive that he can do without them. This principle exhibits itself in early childhood. No sooner does a parent take one child upon his knee, than another is pressing to ascend it. The same principle will, I am persuaded, act upon a larger and more extended scale. If, then, the parent would put this powerful secret of attraction into exercise, let him seek for happiness where alone it can be found, and set his heart supremely upon God.

H. W.

ON CONVOCAION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

The present unparalleled difficulties of our Church Establishment may justify limited information and inferior talent in putting forward their sentiments, if such be found consistent with truth and sterling sense, and be maintained with the manly zeal which our Reformed Church now, more than ever, demands of her sons, in whatever station they may be placed, or to whatever work they may be called.

I propose to follow up my article on Convocation, which you published in a former number, by some general remarks, and an application of the principles therein asserted to passing events—events that are so pregnant with disaster to the continued establishment of the Reformed Faith in Ireland, not to say Britain, that the Protestant who declines an enquiry into the best mode of developing and strengthening the proper, internal, independent powers of his Church, must be either fatuously blind, or else a traitor to the noble cause which he professedly espouses. Who will now talk of depending upon the earthly head of the Church, as the Monarch has (very unadvisedly, I think,) been termed? Who shall now direct his hopes to Houses of Parliament, supposed, in theory, to represent the religious Protestant interests of the nation; but in whose deeds is too truly found whatever Popery, Infidelity, and the worst species of sectarianism, whatever the malignity of determined enemies, and the more fatal treachery of professed adherents, could bring to mar the form of Established Protestantism, and to take away the machinery capable of being effectively employed in its future spiritual improvement? Each suppression of a bishopric takes away one chance, so to speak, of the Church being blessed hereafter with a zealous overseer, endowed with wholesome influence and legitimate authority, to foster and extend the principles which his heart acknowledges, and by which his life is regulated, while it draws the Church still closer in dependence on a power already too well prepared to abuse its privileges, in contributing to her present inefficiency, and eventual prostration. It would be impossible to state too highly (it is long known from experience) the advantages derivable to the interests of religion from really enlightened, pious, and able bishops, as well as the calamity and disgrace resulting from the administration of prelates of an opposite character; and it is sufficiently obvious that each opportunity taken from us of enjoying the former, renders the possible contingency of our subjection to the latter more to be dreaded, as extending the field of corrupt and evil influence. Worldly-minded and irreligious bishops, at all periods a curse to the Church, would, on a diminished bench, and under a more direct exercise of anti-Protestant government

influence, be its utter and irretrievable ruin. At a time when the lower ranks of the Clergy are confessedly improving in knowledge, zeal, and ministerial efficiency, the curtailment of the higher and more influential order is singularly unhappy; for even under a government the most hostile to true religion, out of a large body distinguished by the qualities above mentioned, it might have been probable, under God's grace, that some individuals should have attained to the episcopal office, had its number not been interfered with. All hope that the Church shall enjoy good bishops is not absolutely taken away by the Reform Bill, but it is brought into very diminished bounds, while the power of ministerial hirelings (should such unhappy appointments take place,) to promote objects destructive of genuine Protestantism, is proportionably increased. Talk of it, however, as we will, the measure is past—the evil is done—and our best efforts are too certain to prove unavailing in inducing the King's Ministry and the House of Commons to retrace their course. We must, under profound humiliation and unceasing prayer, look to the internal resources discoverable in the Church's original constitution, for the prevention or mitigation of the evils which surround, and the still greater dangers which threaten her. We have been too much in the habit of depending on external conduct and support; now that they are failing us, we proceed with faltering steps, and an undetermined path. If we have inherent resolution of spirit and vigour of constitution, capable of enduring hardship, and meeting the emergency of a struggle for very existence, they are not, certainly, to be inferred from the attitude and proceedings of our general body, as they have been as yet manifested.

That pure principle, high-souled resolution, and intellectual ability, are absolutely wanting, no one can suppose who has an extended clerical acquaintance, and has observed the conduct of some leading men among us: but the entire absence of concentration, whether of sentiment, design, or effort, every friend of our cause must constantly lament.

To one gentleman (the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee) gratitude is especially due, for the noble zeal with which he stood forward to recommend a point of union, and the indifference he exhibited to the censure, misrepresentation, and low-minded sneers, which such a proposal on the part of a single individual is always certain in a greater or less degree to call forth. Yet constituted as our clerical body is, it was scarcely possible for his proposition to succeed. High principle and talent are not always able to command the influence which they merit, especially among a class of men widely diffused, and of various habits of thinking, induced as well by different views of doctrine and ecclesiastical polity, as by the difference of rank in their appointed stations. Had such a design received, at the outset, the sanction of two or three of the bishops, and of a number of the higher clergy, an impression might possibly have been made on

the body in general, so as to invite them to a concerted movement for meeting the crisis. But however anxious very many of the parochial Clergy were, and are, to adopt any measure which afforded a reasonable expectation of establishing and maintaining the independence of their Church, (I mean independence in spirituals, of the Government and Parliament) they have been too long accustomed to follow in the wake of their superiors, to strike out, on a sudden emergency, a new course for themselves.

With respect to the extreme point of the plan recommended by the gentleman above alluded to, I fear that it was all along surrounded with insuperable difficulties.—I speak of the election of bishops by individual dioceses, and their refusal to submit to the lines of demarcation marked out by the Church Reform Bill. Were the bishops and clergy nearly all of one mind on this subject, a stand on these principles might have been (or might still be) made, highly honourable to the parties, if not finally successful: but where there is so much of timidity, indecision, and want of cordial union, not to speak of lack of principle in some quarters, an abortive attempt of this nature would but exhibit our weakness, without attaining any good result. I own, besides, that I am not favourable to the principle of diocesan election, and far less to the idea of throwing it on the dean and chapter, which would establish an *imperium in imperio* most odious and intolerable to the parochial clergy. I almost think it would be better for us to bear the ills we have, than fly to these others that we know not of. I cannot help differing on this point from the admirable resolutions published by some of the clergy in the diocese of Cork. Supposing the Church were to obtain the privilege of electing her bishops, or of recommending to the Crown a certain number of candidates for selection, would it not do away with much local unpleasantness and collision, to grant the above-mentioned power to her representative body at large, and not to her several dioceses considered singly? I fear that I am now speaking of what will by many be esteemed very visionary, as well in regard to the mode of electing bishops, as to the revival, reconstruction, and assembly of the convocation; yet, on the Church being able to effect this latter object, her future welfare, if not existence, does seem to me in a great measure to depend. I am glad to be fortified in this opinion by the judgment of far superior men, and more able writers, as well expressed in your pages, as published through other channels. The Church owes much to R. D. in particular, for giving this question its just prominence in his valuable papers on her present state and original constitution; and I am convinced that our principal efforts ought now to be directed towards carrying it forward to a successful issue. Under any circumstances of Parliamentary and Court favour, the Church could not thrive as she ought, without her proper, independent, deliberative, and legislative assembly: under present circumstances, when all in-

terference of the Crown and the Legislature is to her weakness and disadvantage, I do not see how she is to get on at all. The majority of the parochial clergy is, beyond doubt, inclined to favour just measures of real spiritual reform and improvement, as well as to resist infringement on the purity of the Reformed Faith; and yet, how difficult, how impossible it is to draw their feeling to one common centre, has in this paper been before noticed! Were the legitimate mode of drawing forth the opinions of the Clergy on great questions of doctrine and church government now in operation, the difficulties which ever must oppose themselves to the efficiency of self constituted assemblies would at once be removed, while energy of zeal and strength of intellect would be devoted to the service of the Church, through an acknowledged, and established, and in this respect a more practicable channel. I am aware that obstacles to the plan of Convocation are to be found in abundance, both within and without the clerical community. That the enemies or lukewarm friends of the Church should feel reluctance to the adoption of a measure evidently tending to the sustenance and encouragement of our own resources, cannot surprise; but that the necessity of the times does not weaken prejudice, and overcome hesitating scruple on the part of those sincerely attached to her, may afford matter of wonder. Wonder is, indeed, but a feeble term to express the feeling naturally excited at the strange and disgraceful position taken up by certain divines, of what is generally called the *High Church* party, but whose desire seems to be the reduction of the Church to as *low* and despicable a dependence on the persons who have betrayed her—to as abject and slavish a prostration before a Government evidently inimical to the cause of genuine Protestantism as it is possible for her enemies to wish. The advocacy of such views, if more general among the clergy, and not happily confined to a few, who, however highly respectable in station, are not likely to influence any considerable number, would be sufficient thoroughly to disgust the sound Protestants of the land, and to estrange their affections for ever from the persons of their ministers. But the writer to whom I principally allude has fallen into far better hands than mine; he has not escaped R. D., nor yet another able champion of truth, who has been before referred to. I am altogether at a loss to conceive how men of his views expect the Church to be sustained in this country. Do they rely on the forbearance of Popery? Do they calculate on the neutrality of Radicalism? Do they imagine that a Whig Government will continue resolutely and consistently to support the Church, even in her present position? Have they a fond dream that even her own lay members are so satisfied with her constitution as it has been experienced for the last hundred years, that they would risk life and fortune to prevent its total demolition? I trust that

the description of a Roman poet will not be made good with regard to them—

“Sentitur plerisque prius quam cernitur ignis
Excitis somno”—

But that awaking in time, they will cast aside that abject dependence on Princes and Legislatures which blinds their eyes to the Church's true interest, and hinders them from assisting to strengthen the things which remain—a dependence much resembling that of the Jews on the King of Egypt, according to the description of Rabshakeh, even the leaning on a bruised reed, about to pierce the hand which seeks its support.

In times not so rife with peril as the present, there were not wanting Fathers of the Church, sensible of her too inert and helpless situation, and desirous of a renewal of her original privileges. A remarkable instance of this occurs in a Latin speech, intended to have been delivered by Archbishop Secker, at the pro forma meeting of the English Convocation in 1761. “Quid ergo? Jubeone vos de synodo actuosâ, deque Ecclesiæ statu per eam emendande desperare? Absit verò. Semper enitendum est, ut antiqui regiminis non modo retineamus formam, sed et vim instauremus, quatenus vel divino vel humano jure fulcitur. Atque interim maneat quodammodo et mutila erit πολιτεία nostra.” If the constitution of the Church, patronized in the fullest extent, as she then was, by the Crown and Houses of Parliament, was described by a sagacious prelate as maimed and shorn of its due proportions, without the meeting of Convocation for actual transaction of business; what ought to be said of it now, either in England or Ireland? Ought the sons of our Church to rest satisfied that her present polity supplied to them no internal rallying point on which to collect, for the removal of dilapidation, occurring through the lapse of time, and for the strengthening of bulwarks? Ought they to be content to see her treacherously delivered up to her bitterest enemies, without ever recurring to the engines of strength which served her cause in former ages? The institution which neglects the ordinary and obvious means of influencing persons connected with it, through the excitement of interest in their minds, and continual endeavours to make them feel their identity with itself, must be content to see itself outstript, and eventually must reap the disastrous consequences of a foolish apathy.

In an age captivated by debate, and the appearance, at least, of activity in public bodies, however men may affect to despise such taste, they cannot, if they wish to acquire or retain influence, omit to indulge it. We may in this respect take a lesson from the enemies of truth. Propt up as the Romish system is by every conceivable adaptation of superstition to the darkened mind of fallen man, for the investment of its clergy with a sa-

perhuman power in the eyes of their deluded flocks, no opportunity is by them omitted still further to strengthen their hands by public assemblages and displays, which serve to arrest the attention of the people, and continually to renew their interest in the affairs of their church. Besides, an enlistment of the laity to actual service, through the bonds of societies and confraternities, exists to an extent little imagined by the generality of Protestants. The example, also, of Protestant Dissenters ought not to be thrown away upon us. The Presbyterians and Seceders have meetings of their Presbyteries and Synods continually occurring, by which the attention of their people is invariably arrested; and they are always careful to have the ordinances and rites of their church, such as the administration of the Lord's Supper, and ordinations, made as impressive and attractive as possible: on the latter occasions, especially, there are always some popular preachers to explain and defend the Presbyterian principles in an easy and intelligible manner. In short, they omit no opportunity of directing the attention of the people to the advantages of the Presbyterian system. I need not say that the direct contrary of all this has been the usual practice of our Church, so that the occurrence of an ordination excites the interest of scarcely any, even of her own members. Happily for our Church, she has thrown aside the anti-christian priestly usurpations, and false pretences, by which Rome holds her votaries, but she ought to remember that her people ought to be continually influenced as a body, in a reasonable and Christian manner. Preaching the Gospel of Christ throughout the parishes is the main work, it is true, but the appearances of the Church, in her corporate capacity, ought to be considered, as well as those of her individual ministers. But these are never made, while the Church of Scotland has her General Assembly, the Presbyterians in this country their Synods, the Methodists their Conferences, &c.: and it is not easy to determine the mass of influence which the stated occurrence of these meetings brings to bear on the respective bodies. I am convinced that were it not for the part which many leading and pious clergymen of our Church have taken in public meetings of religious societies, especially in Dublin, the Dissenting interest would, through such means, have succeeded in abstracting a large portion of her population, and thus, that the course which was eminently disapproved of by many of her members high in office, has proved, through the grace of God, an instrument for her preservation.

But to return to our immediate subject. The apathy of the laity of our Church, as to her peculiar constitution, is a constant theme of remark and lamentation on the part of her friends. That it has not escaped the notice of some who are not her members (though I would be sorry to call them altogether unfriendly) can easily be made apparent. I have heard of an observation made by an intelligent Presbyterian minister, on the Irish Church Re-

form Bill, "that had the Government interfered with the most inconsiderable lay elder of the most inconsiderable Presbyterian congregation in Ulster, the entire country would have been aroused to the highest indignation; whereas, in the present instance, no less than ten of the highest spiritual offices in the Episcopal Church had been at once prospectively abrogated, with comparatively little interest shown by the lay members of that communion." Want of identity in feeling with the constitution of the Church must be the main cause of this apathy in her laity: for I should hope that individually her parochial clergy command as much regard and respect from their flocks as those of most other communions; and this want of identity in feeling must principally arise, first, from not constantly seeing the Church in a prominent situation as a peculiar religious body; and in the next place, from not themselves possessing a voice in the management of her concerns. I draw these conclusions from the known principles which influence communities, and from particular analogies, before referred to, discoverable in other religious bodies. To suggest a sufficient remedy is not so easy as to take notice of a disorder, and I am far from thinking what I have to propose altogether sufficient to meet the evil complained of, though I am certain that, could it be heartily adopted, it would prove a very considerable mitigation. An obvious alternative for the feeling, or rather absence of feeling, complained of in our laity, would be to allow them a certain power in the management of ecclesiastical affairs, which has, indeed, all along been their right by the constitution of the Church, but has been exercised in a mode at the present time to be exceedingly deprecated. Some such method as the following might secure them a representation in convocations: The male communicants of each parish might elect one of their number to meet representatives from the other parishes of the diocese, and, in conjunction with them, to fix upon a proper member to represent the lay portion of the diocese in convocation.

It will, no doubt, be urged by many that such a proposal of mixing the laity with the clergy is contrary to all precedent, and would tend to bring the constitution of our Church to the Presbyterian model. But such objectors are at once involved in an insuperable difficulty by these questions: Does not the original constitution of the Church, as determined by her practice, clearly admit her laity (through the Monarch and Houses of Parliament representing the religious interests of the nation as well as the worldly) to a co-ordinate share of legislation with her clergy? Is not this practice justified by Scripture, especially Acts, xv.? And if all this be undeniably the case, is it not preferable for us to have the privilege vested in godly laymen of our own communion, than very principally in an assembly consisting largely of Papists, Socinians, and Infidels of every description, and at the best, of Churchmen who have in very few instances been returned for the main purpose of protecting the interests of re-

ligion? It is a curious inconsistency, if members of our Church should be found willing to submit to, and even defend her subjection to such legislators as these, and yet fired with angry jealousy at the most distant proposal of conferring a privilege, unquestionably long exercised by her laymen, or that portion of them most capable of using it aright. While she continues an Established Church, she might put these measures in operation from a position of vantage; if she ceases to be so, she will be obliged to adopt some such course, in order to retain any hold whatever upon her people.

In all our discussions upon the constitution of the Church, we should never lose sight of its prime work, without achieving which, in some degree, it is utterly worthless, and will assuredly be cast off by God—the extension of the knowledge of Christ, and the edification of his people, to their encrease in faith, hope, and love: and as the Church best ordered in external arrangement, and proper division of office and government, will, without the performance of that work, be as sounding brass or a tinkling symbol; so will the Church, maintaining the cause of the Lord, and diligently propagating the truth of his Gospel, be acknowledged by Him, although it offend by visible blots of constitution. The candlestick will not be removed from its place on account of mal-formation of its branches, but because it wants the pure light which should burn within them. Let the Ministers of our Church, therefore, take heed to themselves and to their doctrine, and let its lay members receive with meekness the engrafted Word, which is able to save their souls: and let all stand as one man, contending for the faith which was once delivered to the saints. I am encouraged in this view of our Church more than any other, for her witnesses of the truth are neither few nor silent; and I cannot but express a feeling of gladness, in which many of your readers will join, that such decided and eminently powerful testimony should have of late proceeded from the seat of education itself, to the grand doctrine of justification by faith only. It must be hailed as a token of good for our Church, that sustenance like this should be provided for the minds of her rising ministers.

CLERICUS SEPTENTRIONALIS.

A POEM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—I venture to offer for your acceptance the following Poem, composed at a period when the disease to which it principally relates engrossed and appalled every reflecting or serious mind.

The passing away of that calamitous season will, in the estimation of many, furnish an argument against the publication of this humble effort now.

If it were designed by Providence that the impression of terror, or the loud call to humiliation and repentance before God, should have been as transient as the cloud of Divine wrath, which, in the fearful character of plague, hung successively over the chief cities of our Empire, and the world; I, too, might yield to the same conviction, and suppress my very underserving and unpretending labour.

But I am far from holding such an opinion. I esteem it rather the bounden duty, as it is, I am sure, the acceptable service, of every persuaded Christian, to be a fellow-worker with the Heavenly Father in perpetuating the memory of his mercies and judgments, and carrying them with power and the Holy Spirit into the careless heart.

Not that I arrogate to the subjoined narrative such efficacy; but request that it be received as written in that hope.

The details are neither entirely imaginary, nor yet altogether true, at least as far as my own experience has reached; possibly real events more than justify the ideas of the writer.

The extract which I make from the very interesting Pamphlet of Dr. J. C. Ferguson, of this City, (Dublin,) describing the ravages of Cholera at Sunderland and Newcastle, in the year 1832, will serve to demonstrate how little fancy can out-run reality, in this instance:—

“And how awfully has it ran through whole families. To relate instances would be only to harrow up our feelings unnecessarily. The melancholy truth is unquestioned by any, that within a few short days the mother has been left widowed and childless, the father robbed of the wife he loved, and child in whom were centered all his hopes; perhaps, also, of the friend or relative whose dying hour he had solaced, unconscious and unheeding that from them he was to carry to his home the source of all his misery; the child has been left an orphan, perhaps friendless, and even an entire family extinguished.”

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your very obedient servant,

Dublin, Feb. 1, 1834.

J. S. K.

POEM.

Why speeds the funeral tread,
 Your lonely streets among?
 Tell, sable servants of the dead,
 What freight ye bear along?

We bear a widow's only son,
 At morning's dawn his race was run.

Ye bear a widow's only son:
 But why no widow's wail?
 Not yet two fleeting hours are gone,
 The last long death sigh, scarcely flown,
 Floats on the trampling gale.

Why bid the scarce cold youth to brave
 The terrors of the untimely grave?

Another band draws near!
 Pale ministers of fate,
 Who sleep on yonder silent bier,
 Array'd in mournful state?

'Twas yestern an a wedded bride;
 The wassail bowl is still undried.

A wedded bride! but where is he
 Who pledged the fond, the ardent vow,
 In health and sickness still to be
 Unbitt'rd, unchang'd, unlur'd from thee?
 False to his pledges now!

Surely no guilty wiles had power
 O'er love and truth, at funeral hour.

On the dark pageants roll:
 Seems it some noiseless dream:
 No peals of passing death-bells toll,
 No sound of woe-born scream.

What bring you now? A father dead:
 Five weeping sons stood round his bed.

Five weeping sons! And are there none
 To bear him to the grave,
 Or mourn that loved existence gone?
 Which each, by forfeit of his own,
 Had gladly died to save.

Does thirst of gold their hearts inspire,
To snatch the coffers of their sire ?

No, stranger, no ; such feeble cause
Shakes not the frame of nature's laws ;
Or dries the current, deep and strong,
That bears our sympathies along.—
Think'st thou a mother's sobs were still
In such extremity of ill ?
Or seize, as food to sate thy scorn,
The bridal night a funeral morn ?
Or deem that filial love expires
On the same couch where die the sires.

Oh, hadst thou heard the thrilling shriek,
It seemed as every string would break,
And every chain that binds the heart
To life and hope, asunder part :
Such blast came o'er the mother's joy
When first she mark'd her plague-struck boy.

She saw his smooth and candid brow,
All furrow'd with deep anguish now ;
The lustre of his once bright eye
Fast fading in death's agony ;
His tuneful voice, which softly fell,
As if some heavenly tale to tell,
In whispering accents feebly tries
To soothe a mother's bursting sighs.
Saw the strong arm, whose ready aid,
A mother's falt'ring footsteps stay'd,
Convuls'd and quiv'ring, low recline,
Widow, more feebly far than thine.

What muse shall paint the varying form
Of grief and passion's changeful storm ?
November's blasts, or April's showers ;
Ocean's wild waves, when tempest lours ;
The clash of billows, as they roar
In thunder, on the surge-worn shore :
So wildly forth, in anguish roll,
The burstings of a mother's soul.

Nor deem it strange, in that dark hour
Of death and woe, if sin had power
And strength allowed, a while to try
A Christian's wav'ring constancy.
Oh, wilt thou leave me ? must we part ?
Sweet solace of my bleeding heart ;

Bright lamp of hope, whose cheering ray
 Pour'd on life's night the blaze of day.
 Thou only charm that lull'd to rest
 The troubles of my aching breast ;
 Thou only balm that sooth'd the care,
 By sorrow fix'd, to rankle there ;
 Thou only boon which heaven could give,
 To bribe my widow'd soul to live.

Sure 'twere enough that I should mourn
 The ashes of a consort's urn,
 And bathe an infant in my tears,
 Scarce reach'd myself to woman's years.
 The lovely orphan as it grew,
 Would oft its sire's caress renew—
 Oft, with a mild enchanting smile,
 My lonely bosom's grief beguile ;
 And haply, by its artless plays,
 Recal the bliss of earlier days.
 As when the autumn zephyr blows
 The leaflets from the withering rose,
 The faded fragments idly stray,
 Borne from their fragrant home away ;
 Yet, the fond zephyr's gentle breath
 Reveals the freshness still beneath,
 Unveils the still unfaded flowers,
 Sweet remnant of its summer hours.

Why do destroying angels fall
 Upon my life, my hope, my all ?
 Or deem a widow's mite may be
 Cast into death's full treasury ?

“ But, oh ! Redeemer of mankind,
 Bring calmness to my troubled mind ;
 Grant that this suffering soul may be
 In glory meet to live with thee.
 Purge each foul stain of earthly dross,
 And nail it to thy bleeding cross.
 Let thy free grace its gifts impart,
 To heal the anguish of my heart.
 Subdue it to thy heavenly will,
 And bid its murmurings “ peace, be still.”

While her pale lips pronounc'd the Sacred name,
 A trembling thrill of well-known presage came ;
 Chill thro' her veins the freezing currents flow ;
 Her failing heart-pulse wavers, faint and slow.
 On the lov'd form she fix'd her glazing eye,

Kiss'd his wan cheek, and drank his parting sigh.
 Low by the couch where all her treasures slept,
 In silent prayer the kneeling mother wept.
 Her prayer is heard—no murmuring accents fall
 In vain rebellion to the heavenly call.
 Blessed be thy gracious will, good God, she cried,
 Gazed on her son, and as she gazed, he died.

Thou sawest yon scanty train
 Wend mournfully its way,
 Ne'er shall the darksome tomb contain,
 Nor arms of love and youth sustain
 A freight more fair than they.

A mingled plume is borne, to wave
 Its witness o'er the simple grave.
 Sable with argent wreath entwines,
 To grace the bier wherewithon reclines
 She, thus too rudely rest of life,
 A wedded maid, a virgin wife.

Yes, thou wert fair as ever sun
 In his glad course had shone upon ;
 Fair as in song of minstrels told,
 And cast in beauty's perfect mould.
 Queen of all hearts ; the morning's light
 Ne'er beamed on weary traveller's sight,
 All glowing in the orient skies,
 More joyous than thy sparkling eyes.

And, maiden, tho' thy form was fair,
 A mind still lovelier harboured there ;
 Truth, virtue, innocence, arrayed
 In thy sweet voice, their powers displayed ;
 And Christian love, and hope, confessed
 A welcome to thy guileless breast.

He, the fond youth whose favored love
 Was blessed that guileless breast to prove ;
 Tall, graceful, true, his manly form
 Bore candour's stamp, and kindness warm,
 And trumpet tones of early fame
 Spoke the high promise of his name.
 And ne'er at Hymen's altar bent
 Two kindred hearts more fondly blent.

The bridal banquet now was o'er,
 No longer heard the merry strain ;
 And laugh, and festive song, no more

Burst from the joyous train.
 Forth from the tender lover's side
 The bride's-maids lead the blooming bride,
 Beneath deep canopy to rest,
 Like Eve star on a mountain's crest.
 The sapphire bright, and diamond's blaze
 The amethyst's cerulean rays,
 The flowers that deck her braided hair,
 Rich with the gems that sparkle there ;
 And nuptial robe of dazzling white
 Yield to the simpler dress of night.

But ah, what means that deep-drawn sigh ?
 Why fades the lustre of thine eye ?
 Thy soft hand trembles ; sure 'tis sought :
 Some maiden fear, some timid thought ;
 Some airy vision of the past.
 Some mists thy future prospect.

Alas ! thy cheek is wan and pale ;
 Dark shadows o'er thy brow prevail,
 And transient tints of deepening blue
 Rise damp and chill as morning dew.

Thy tapering limbs are seen to be
 Convulsed as in death's agony :
 And gathering symptoms, one by one,
 Tell the dread tale—the plague's begun !

Oh deep, unfathomable still
 By mortal view, the Heavenly will.
 Let not the ken of erring man
 Presume its dark behests to scan,
 Or raise the veil, that dims the light
 Of God's dread form, to mortal sight.
 Who would have deemed the bride were led
 From bridal hall to funeral bed ?
 Or bridal flowers, the chaplets bloom,
 Cast all unfaded o'er the tomb ;
 Or the light maiden's airy cloud
 Wrap those fair limbs a funeral shroud ?

Yet such is life's uncertain day ;
 So fade man's phantom hopes away.
 The scheme we form at morning's light,
 Is frustrate e'er the hour of night ;
 And night's vain plans, a prey to scorn,
 Bide not the dawning of the morn. . .

The lover sat in the festive hall ;
 Light was his heart, and his hopes beat high.
 From his lips the joyous accents fall,
 And sunbeams flash from his sparkling eye.

But ah, too soon his joy was o'er !
 A flying figure crossed the door—
 So fair, it seemed the day-star bright,
 Clad in the robe of sable night ;
 So pale, so wan, as tho' it sped
 On errand of the kindred dead.

Was't not a brides-maid ? Will she dare
 To brave, so clad, the midnight air ?
 Why this mad race ? Another passed
 More wild, more grief-worn than the last.
 'Twas the fond nurse, whose fostering breast
 The bride in infancy had pressed,
 And watchful care and love had shed
 From cradle to the nuptial bed.
 And as she passed, a deep-drawn sigh
 Burst forth, so sad, so mournfully,
 Her very life-blood seemed to flow
 With slackened stream, so deep her woe.

Scarce gone, when to the chamber came
 A weeping maid : 'tis, sure, the same,
 'Tis she who lately stood beside,
 Companion of the blushing bride ;
 In beauty's pride she shone afar,
 Like Cynthia's bright attendant star.
 But why so sad ? Her eye appears
 All dimly, thro' her gushing tears :
 The pallid cheeks too well confess
 The breaking heart's extreme distress :
 And thus her sorrowing accents fall
 Faint, whispering, through the silent hall.

“ I come, unbidden, to impart
 A tale to pierce thy inmost heart.
 Unbidden come, for tho' each sigh,
 Even in the keenest agony,
 Soft heaving, breathes thy dear loved name.
 Yet deemed she now that here I came,
 And on this mournful errand sped
 To call thee to the dying bed ?
 No : tho' thy sight were sure to be
 A balm in life's extremity,

In this sad hour of fate and fear
She would not peril one so dear,
Or risk thy days, were this the last,
The only look she hoped to cast,
Till death lies vanquished in the tomb,
And lovers meet in realms to come."

The maiden paused—the youth's wild gaze
Seemed fix'd, as in some dream's amaze :
His panting breast had ceased to heave,
As life itself its seat would leave.
Pale his sad cheek—the faded ray,
By terror quenched, is fled away.
But mark : again the mantling blush
Pours the red tide with ruder gush ;
Once more his face is seen to glow,
Once more his faltering accents flow,
And speak the dear, the long-loved name,
All thrilling thro' his stricken frame.
One moment yet—the trance is o'er,
Like light-flash now he gains the door,
Mounts the high stair with bounding stride,
And kneels his dying spouse beside.

To few is given such pain to know—
Torn from the darkest page of woe,
Manhood and love would fain conceal
What grief and nature must reveal,
Would dry the tear-drop on the eye,
Stifle the groan, and still the sigh,
And strive, with counterfeited smile,
E'en death's dread hour to gild the while ;
But vainly, vainly love aspires
To quench its self-enkindled fires,
And vainly strives to cast a shade
On the fair light itself has made.

Awhile his voice was calm and low,
Awhile his softened accents flow,
And brow serene conceals the strife
That racks his very life of life.
But brief the struggle—Nature's sway
Soon dashed the half drawn mask away,
And as in clouds when thunders roll,
Flashed forth the anguish of his soul.

"Oh ! thou Great God, who rulest on high
The course of mortal destiny,
Wilt thou, at one fell swoop, destroy

Thy prostrate creature's hope and joy,
Bid their twin bands asunder part,
Or crush them with this broken heart!

" Maid of my love, it must not be—
Death hath no power to set thee free;
The might which breaks such vows as thine
May sooth be strong, 'tis not divine.

" Fairest of all that ever earth
In its wide bounds has given birth,
Oh! pass not in thy nuptial hour,
Like fragrance of some closing flower,
That scents the glade till eve has won
Her triumph o'er the burning sun,
And frail and transient as his ray,
Melts, with the sinking orb, away!

" No; the dark cloud that fain would spread
Its sable pall around thy bed,
Like mist dispelled by orient dawn,
Leaves the gay dew-drop on the lawn;
The sparklig gem its tints unfold
In hues of azure and of gold,
And glittering in the morning ray,
Hangs pendant from the trembling spray;
Till some fond bird, whose tuneful throat
Pours in full tide the warbling note,
Faint, parched, and drooping, seeks the plain,
Drinks the bright pearl, and lives again.

" So, fairest, loveliest, shalt thou,
Though dark clouds gather o'er thee now,
Fresh as the morn and bright as dew,
Cast off their gloom and shine anew!

" Yes, thou shalt live, my wedded wife,
Thou only fountain whence my life
Quaffs the sweet stream whose limpid flow
Rivals the bliss the heavens bestow."

At length the maiden silence broke,
Her pale lips quivered as she spoke:—

" Dear youth, the dew from this frail spray
Is brushed by death-birds-wing away;
The flower that shed its fragrance round,
Lies faint and withering on the ground;
Nor dew nor flower shall e'er again
Shine on the spray or scent the plain.

" A few short moments, and the last;
The closing scene of life is past;
The foeman of our mortal race
Steals onward with a silent pace,
And sure and swiftly deals the blow
That lays thy own betrothed low.

" 'Tis sinful to arraign our God,
Who waves on high his chastening rod;
'Tis sinful to distrust the love
Abounding in his courts above,
Or doubt, though veiled from mortal sight,
This sacred truth—What is, is right.

" Yet, ah! had so it pleased that I
Were spared this cup of destiny,
Spared but a season, youth, to prove
The firm devotion of my love.
Thou knowest I love thee—love thee so
As woman's breast alone can know;
I love thee, when the morning's ray
Pours the full flood of early day;
I love thee when the fiery sun
Tells half his heavenly race is run;
I love thee when at eventide
He sinks beneath the mountain side;
I love thee when the sable night
Veils my fond blush from mortal sight;
Thy lovely image haunts my dream,
Like genius of some fabled stream;
Thy lovely voice seems thrilling near,
Soft music to my listening ear.

" If e'er my fancy dared to stray
One moment from my love away,
Though brief the space, its wings would roam,
Fluttering o'er kindred friends or home.
Home, kindred, friends, appeared to be
As sunless worlds, when wanting thee;
Existence dragged a lingering chain,
And fancy flew to love again.

" Dear object of my virgin vow,
'Tis gladness to behold thee now;
E'en now when this scarce-beating heart,
Too truly tells we soon must part.
Lord of my bosom's love, 'twere joy
To make thy bliss without alloy,

The constant solace of thy life,
Thy loved, thy faithful, cherished wife.

“ And, oh ! if adverse fate should throw
On life's smooth path a chastening woe,
'Twere mine, when every hope was o'er,
The balm of truest love to pour,
To smooth thy brow, recal thy smile,
That play'd upon thy lips erewhile,
And bid thine eye of sparkling blue
The radiance of its beams renew.

“ Sweet love, thou sighest ; thy cheek is pale,
As lily in some lonely vale ;
Thy trembling hand is damp and chill ;
But why these presages of ill ?

“ 'Tis my cold hand its chillness leaves,
And failing sense my sight deceives.
Yes, we must part, and sad, forlorn,
Thou'lt still thy absent consort mourn,
O'er her lone tomb, while tall weeds wave,
Nature's wild crown that decks the grave,
Thy constant grief will shed the tear
From eyes, oh, heaven ! alas ! too dear—
Too dear—for as they beamed on me,
They drove heaven from my memory,
Or lured my soul from truth's bright sphere,
To fondly dream its heaven were here.

“ But all is past—oh ! may He
Who lets the captive spirit free
Wash in the Lamb, for sinners slain,
My vile affections' loathsome stain ;
And this frail form array'd above,
In seamless vesture of his love,
Put on the robes of glory bright,
Companion of the saints in light.

“ Nay, love, thou speak'st not—why that grasp
That clenches as with iron clasp ?
Press me, oh ! press me to thy breast,
Ere this poor frame has sank to rest !
Repeat thy morning's vow, and mine,
In answering tones, replies, I'm thine !
Seal on my lips the parting sigh—
They'll open in eternity,
When free from death, from sin and pain,
In joyous realms we meet again.”

Some griefs there be of such deep dye,
Pen fails their mournful tints to try ;
Dark, drear, and sad, they shun our sight,
And live entombed in their own night.
Such grief was then ; but who shall dare
To probe the soul's corroding care,
Or with unfeeling gaze intrude
Into the heart's sad solitude.

Enough, the lover saw the maid
Low on the funeral pallet laid—
Saw all on earth his soul held dear
Upraised by gravesmen on the bier ;
But death held court, and he must now
Before the King of Terrors bow.

The fearful summons calls away
To grace the despot's festal day.
The band returns—his life is fled—
He too is numbered with the dead ;
In one cold grave they sleep beside—
The bridegroom and his maiden bride.

Why should we still prolong the lay—
Why still with lingering verse essay,
Unkilled and feeble, still to trace
The sorrows of our fallen race.
While floating on the fitful blast,
Each wailing death-note seems the last,
Till rising tones, with descent true,
Proclaim the conqueror's march anew,
And sounds of sadness heard from far,
Tell of the yet unfinished war.

Death's billows roll, and wave on wave
Pour on the still insatiate grave,
And sink in its engulfing sand
Like pilgrims on the Lydian strand.

Thus the five sons, whose filial balm
Soothed his last hour to holy calm,
As smitten by the prophet's rod,
Pour forth their streaming souls to God.
All that were once a father's pride,
Had wept his dying couch beside,
And each and all in vain essay,
To honor his departing clay,
Essay to raise the lifeless load,
And bear it to its long abode.

In vain essay, for envious death
Palm'd their arm and hush'd their breath.

Far in the heart the plague began,
And cold its icy current ran,
Chill'd the deep artery's languid flow,
The vacant veins no longer glow
Alternate from its hidden spell,
The labouring muscles sink and swell,
Rack'd nerves and straining sinews claim
Dominion on the tortured frame ;
The heaving bosom's angry play
Casts its dark loathsome load away ;
Cold from the lips the soft sighs pour,
Like gusts from Lapland's frozen shore ;
And damp and clammy moisture spread
As ointment o'er the newly dead,
Till death, triumphant in the strife,
Storms the last citadel of life.

So perish all in one brief day,
Borne by death's rolling tide away.
The trump of heavenly vengeance blows
Its dreaded note of human woes,
And far o'er earth and ocean's bound
Pours the deep terrors of its sound.

Widow with son, and son with sire,
Bridegroom and blooming bride expire ;
By besom of destruction's sweep
Laid in the grave's oblivious sleep.

Thou great First Cause, who, from thy throne on high,
Wavest thy dread sceptre o'er heaven's canopy,
And bid'st unnumbered worlds around thee shine,
Called into being by thy word divine ;
Oh ! Thou that hearest prayer, to thee we come,
Wanderers too long from thy paternal home.
All flesh is grass—and man, the field's frail flower,
Buds, blossoms, falls, and withers in an hour.
Spare us, good Lord ! stay the destroying hand,
Nor scatter vengeance o'er our guilty land !
Spare, or we perish in thy wrathful flood !
Spare the redeemed by Christ's most precious blood !
Let Mercy's hand withhold the uplifted rod,
Lest heathen triumph—Where is now their God ?
Wide o'er our soil the wasting sickness spread,
Reaps the rich harvest of the ingathered dead,

And blasts of anger darkening every face,
Freeze the free fountains of eternal grace.
Lord, we have sinned—like sheep, have gone astray,
And far and faithless left the heavenly way.
True are thy counsels as thy wrath is just,
Yet pity, Lord, thy creatures of the dust;
O'er guilty man thy robe of love be cast,
And for a Saviour's sake, forgive the past !

J. S. K.

ON SCRIPTURAL EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—Having various means of deriving information concerning Scriptural education in the South of Ireland, I am anxious to address you on the subject. In doing so, I wish first to inform you, that Scriptural education is in a declining state—that several of the schools, especially those in remote parishes, have been given up, and that others must soon follow, unless funds can be raised to support them. The failure may be ascribed not only to the public Parliamentary grant being withdrawn, but to the reduced incomes of the Clergy, who cannot support the schools as they formerly did.

My next object in writing to you is, to entreat the friends of Scriptural education to meet immediately, and with prayer for Divine guidance, to deliberate on the most effectual way for supporting this important cause. I would humbly propose for their consideration the following suggestions: *First*, the union of the present Scriptural Education Societies; and *Secondly*, that effective deputations should be sent to every town, and, if possible, deputations on a smaller scale, to every village and parish in our country.

As to the first suggestion, I acknowledge there are great difficulties in the way. I know that some members of the old Societies will object to any change; but still, I would ask, can the present Societies subsist exactly as they are now constituted? Can the same number of agents, travelling secretaries, and clerks exist? Can the same salaries be continued to each? I feel they cannot. Things are now come to such a crisis that reductions must be made, every sacrifice submitted to, and every thing give way for the paramount object of extending Scriptural schools in the country districts, and supplying the masters with salaries. Suppose the London, Hibernian, and Kildare Street Societies were to unite, and devote themselves exclusively to the work of Scriptural education; if they cordially joined, I am convinced, not only the number of schools hitherto under these Societies would be kept up, but that we should have an actual

encrease of schools. If the two Societies were to unite, we should have a great saving, not only from the number of agents, secretaries, and clerks being reduced, but also from some objects being transferred to other Societies, such as those connected with Scripture Readers and Sunday School instruction. The public, too, seeing these Societies sinking lesser differences, and making an united, zealous, and powerful effort for extending Scriptural education through the length and breadth of the land, would, I feel assured, give larger contributions to the cause.

Should the two Societies unite or continue separate, I would propose in either case, that deputations should be sent throughout the country, to sound the alarm among the friends of the Bible in Ireland. Let them tell the fact, that the doors of many schools have been shut, for the want of a small salary for the master. Let them declare that as Government has withdrawn its assistance from Scriptural education, it depends solely on the benevolence of the Protestants of the country to maintain the cause. Let them point out what they think wrong in the new Board of Education, and what zeal is now exerted to encrease its schools, and to induce (*miscalled-liberal*) Protestants to give their influence. Let them show how Popery and Infidelity are united against the Scriptures in every possible way; and if, under the influence of the enemy of souls, they should succeed in their attempt, how dreadful must be the consequences, not only to the present, but to future generations—that darkness must cover the land, and gross darkness the people.

I remain, Sir,

A LOVER OF SCRIPTURAL EDUCATION.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN TWO JEWS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—I have met with the following letters between two Jews in Holland, in a periodical of the last century; should you deem them worth inserting in the EXAMINER, I feel certain they will be new to most of your readers. To myself they appeared to merit greater publicity than I am aware of their having obtained, for the interesting manner in which they exhibit the progress of an enquiring mind, in that most important of all its exercises, viz., the search after truth: but still more, for the beautiful manner in which they evince the efficacy of the genuine practical exhibition of Christ's religion to overcome opposition to the Christian faith, whether such opposition arise from the prejudices of education, or from libertinism, or both together. Who can calculate what the effects produced on the despisers, the opposers, and the neglecters of our most holy faith would be, if the professors of that faith were known and read of all men as the epistles of Christ? The truth would then commend itself to men's consciences with such force of persuasiveness as could not easily be resisted. In case of your favoring them with insertion, should any one who may happen to read them feel impressed thereby with a sense of the obligation of walking in wisdom towards them that are without, my design will be answered: and should any one whose eye they may meet be able to give any farther information respecting the parties, such information would much gratify yours very truly,

MINIM.

"JOSEPH DE L. TO ISRAEL C.

"Amsterdam, June 29, 1784.

"Many thanks for your kind entertainment and tender sympathy. Often I was about to unbosom myself to you, when, during my late visit, you again and again enquired the cause of my depression. I now venture it. Have pity upon me, and examine what is truth before you injure yourself and me.

"One day I overheard your worthy gardener, WILLIAM, tell another Christian servant, that the sermon had been that morning upon these words, 'Ye have killed the Prince of Life.' Fears what would become of me, if that were true, so agitated me the whole night, that after a short and suddenly interrupted sleep, I arose early to walk in your garden. There I soon met William, who, with honest and undissembled goodness asked me, 'What vexes you? Often when you imagined you were not seen, I have observed you in the garden sighing, wringing your hands, and lifting up your eyes to heaven. Are you unhappy?' 'As wretched as possible.' 'How Sir? You are a man of fortune, and being unmarried,

have no family distress.' 'Yes, but I am a Jew.' 'Well, you are not at all the worse on that account: thousands of your nation live merrily.' 'But if it is true, what your minister preached yesterday?' William, leaping back some paces, asked, full of surprise, 'How know you what my minister preached?' 'I heard you tell it yesterday to John.' 'Well, but (with the same breath) Peter told his countrymen, *'Now, brethren, I know that through ignorance ye did it.'* 'Be it so, dear William: but I who see stronger proofs of your religion around me, and even in my own wandering and depressed nation, am less excusable.' 'Yet the Prince of Life prayed for his murderers, and commanded that to them, first, remission of sins should be preached. You are of the nation beloved for the father's sake.' He would have added more, when seeing you, he broke off, and whispered in my ear, *'My Jesus loves even his murderers.'* Soon after, as I was stepping into a shute, I stumbled, and probably should have been drowned, had not the minister of the village, (whom I had the day before, against my conscience, joined you in ridiculing,) caught hold of me with his hand. 'Honest man, said I, what virtue is this, to rescue from death one of a nation which killed your Prince of Life.' He kindly replied, 'My Master loves even his murderers.' I cannot express what I felt when I heard these words repeated, and what anxiety has filled my mind ever since."

ISRAEL C. TO JOSEPH DE L.

"Maarsan, July 6, 1784.

"I am happy you have discovered your fanaticism to me, and to no other. Leave it to the learned to discuss whether the religion of Moses, or of Jesus, or Mahomet, is the best: and may I have money, and wine, and pleasure. I laugh at our Rabbis cursing those who would turn Christians. I lately had a letter from my nephew, Samuel C. at London, with 'Priestly's Institutes, and History of the Corruptions of Christianity.' The man expressly says that *the idolatry of Christians began with deifying Jesus*. Jesus was once in high credit: the stocks are now falling. If they fall a little lower, the infidels in a few years shall canonize Caiphas for condemning him as a blasphemer and impostor. This evening I drink your health, and Dr. Priestly's, in good Champaigne."

JOSEPH DE L. TO ISRAEL C.

"Rotterdam, July 20, 1784.

"Perhaps my thoughts of religion are too gloomy, but I fear yours are rash, rather than considerate. Will God excuse our leaving religion to the learned? Is it of small importance whether Moses and Jesus were impostors, or ambassadors from heaven? If the last, is he in no danger who rejects either or both? I have long known that Christians think differently about Jesus, and therefore Priestly's books surprise me not. The dignity of Christ, however, is as little affected by this as Moses's character

was by the rebellion of Korah. The lawful authority of a king ceaseth not when some of his subjects dispute it, or take up arms against it. Men's maintaining or denying that Jesus was sent of God, or was the Son of God, proves nothing either way. Yet, from carefully reading the New Testament, which I tell you in confidence I have done, I wonder that any who would be accounted candid, should assert without blushing that Jesus assumed no other character than that of an excellent man.

"Our Law forbids giving to any creature the honour due to God alone. For transgressing this Law the ten tribes were led captive to Assyria, and Judah to Babylon. When the Jews were restored again to their own land, remembering their severe though just punishment, they abhorred idolatry, and cleaved to their covenant God. We cannot suppose that he would lay snares for them; and expose them to the hazard of again worshipping a mere creature. Every word or action which seemed to approve of this would be avoided by a Divine messenger.

"When the Lystrians were about to offer sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas, those disciples of Jesus remonstrated that they were but men. But Jesus himself did not thus rebuke Thomas when he said, 'My Lord and my God!' Or Peter, when he said, 'Lord, thou knowest all things.' His asking a young man, 'Why callest thou me good? There is none good, save One, that is God,' cannot be construed as declining Divine honour: for the young man had no design to bestow it. 1st John 5. styles Jesus 'the true God, and eternal Life,' in plain and simple language, and in immediate connexion with a warning, 'Little children, keep yourselves from idols.'

"The Apostles describe him as *the Author of Nature*; John, i. 1—3; Heb. i. 3; Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 16; where the same elevated expressions are used which Paul uses with respect to the Supreme God, Rom. xi. 36. They represent him as *before all things*, Col. i. 17; as *omniscient*, John ii. 25; as *asserting his own omnipresence*, Matt. xviii. 20, and xxviii. 20. Yea, they scruple not to call him God. God over all, blessed for ever; Rom. ix. 8.

"He speaks of himself, indeed, John, xiv. 28; Matt. xxiv. 36; John, v. 17, 30, as inferior to the Father, and ignorant of some things. In other texts he represents himself, or is represented by the Apostles, as equal to the Father, and knowing all things. In vain it is urged, that Jesus only termed himself God in the sense in which magistrates have their titles, Psalm lxxxii. When he told his enemies, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,' and the Jews understood him as claiming equality with God, instead of charging them with mistaking his meaning, he tells them he did like works with his Father; that he was entitled to *like honour, and existed and lived in the same manner*, John, v. 21. 23. 26, &c.

"The Apostles preached Jesus to the Jews, with whom idolatry was treason against God and their constitution; and to heathens, who were strongly attached to idolatry; to both in a manner shamefully imprudent, if they meant not that their Master should be worshipped as God. I see

not, therefore, how Dr. Priestly's scheme can pave the way for our nation's becoming Christian. He cannot remove their offence at a crucified man being represented as God, unless by keeping from them the Books of the New Testament, and persuading them to believe, on his authority, a different account of Jesus from what is there exhibited. One who, if he was *only* the son of Mary, assumed to himself divine honours, whatever other works of the Messiah apply to him, must be an impostor. But if he be indeed a *divine* Person, this fulfils the expectations which the Old Testament raised of the Messiah as 'God with us,' and 'the Lord (Jehovah) our righteousness.' If he was not God, the world is indebted to Mahomet for delivering so great a part of it from the idolatry of honouring him as they honour God. And what shall become of me, if I should acknowledge such a blasphemer as the Messiah? *But if he be indeed God, what shall become of me? what shall become of my nation? what shall become of those, who, calling themselves by his name, debase his dignity?* Alas, where I looked to find comfort, I sink into an abyss of doubts.

"I find a temporary relief in unbecoming to you my perplexity. Yet, alas, how imperfect! My friend laughs at all religion, and what comfort can I expect from him? I sometimes think of writing to your nephew, Samuel C., who is so learned in our religion; and, like Moses Mendelsohn, seems to have embraced it on examination. Dare I venture that? Dare I confide in his secrecy and tolerant spirit? Or is there danger lest he expose me? I entreat your advice."

ISRAEL C. TO JOSEPH DE L.

"Maarsan, Oct. 3, 1785.

"I am no longer disposed to laugh at religion, or to plead that Christianity has no comforts in death. I witnessed the last moments of my worthy gardener, and wish I may die his death. And if there be happiness in another life, this disciple of Jesus is assuredly happy. When the physician told him he was in extreme danger, 'How,' said he, 'can that be, when God is my Father, Jesus my Redeemer, Heaven my country, and death the messenger of peace? The greatest risk I run is to die; but to die is to enter into complete and endless bliss.' Next follows his edifying conversation with the infidel physician, and with a Socinian gentleman: his last words were, 'I die, but what need that trouble me; my Jesus is the True God, and Eternal Life.'

"I could not but impart what, according to your taste and ideas, must be interesting. You see I can be serious."

ON THE LITURGY.

As commissions have now been issued, and acted on, to examine the state of ecclesiastical law in the Church of England, and the temporalities of the Church of Ireland, it appears that the circumstances connected with it are not of that intangible or unapproachable character which we have been led to suppose; but that every thing connected with its structure, "as by law established," is liable to the same imperfections that attach to all human institutions, and are and ought to be liable to the same revision and correction as the laws of any other civil establishment. It is true, that there is inherent in the very nature of the Church, something that confers upon it a reverence and solemnity that no other institution can have. Its foundations are laid in the depths of eternity; its views extend to the heavens, and its sanctions are the awful promises or threatenings of an immortal God. To disturb, with a light or careless hand, such a structure, and to endanger the whole edifice by rude and violent alterations, would be little less than sacrilege and impiety. Whatever, therefore, is connected with its essential and fundamental principles, its scriptural doctrines, or its Christian duties, should be held as the most sacred and unalterable of human possessions; but in things that are non-essential to its existence—things that are ἀδιάφορα, or indifferent in themselves, as the first Reformers called them—matters of mere form and discipline, which every sect of Christians think they have, and actually have a right to model and alter as their views change, or as expediency may require; such things forming the mere perishable superstructure which man has raised on the imperishable foundations of the Scriptures, are not only proper objects of investigation and correction, but they imperatively call for constant revision and alteration, as bearing upon their body the very stamp of human imperfection, and liable to all its fluctuating mutations.

Among these, perhaps, may be classed the Liturgy of our Church. Composed at a period when our language was rude and coarse, and the import and meaning of many words altogether different from the sense in which they are taken at the present day; constructed at a time when the angry passions of men were highly excited, and every one thought himself justified in giving vent, even in the house of God, to all his uncharitable prejudices against his neighbour; made up of a variety of separated parts, which in themselves were simple and concise, but when combined together in one body, formed a service of repetition and unnecessary prolixity; these, and many other objections of a similar kind, which every congregation feels and expresses as often as it assembles in the house of God, seem to render it a matter of general desire, and therefore of unquestionable expediency, that such a revision should be now made as would remove the excrescences which deform its fair face, and render it as it, ought to be,

and might become, the most beautiful and perfect of human compositions.

In approaching a subject, however, in which all our early impressions and most solemn associations are involved, we naturally and justly feel a degree of diffidence and timidity proportionable to the magnitude and seriousness of the subject. The very modes of expression are consecrated by constant habit and early adoption, and however uncouth or strange they would sound in common usage, when in connection with the service of our Church, they seem something even more hallowed than more correct and appropriate expressions. We should recollect, however, that though habit has thus entwined them with *our* feelings, it has not with those of our children; and the rising generation may be brought up with the same veneration for what is correct and elegant, that we have imbibed for many things which on any other occasion would be unamiable and barbarous. I will, therefore, with great diffidence and respect, but, at the same time, with a deep conviction of its propriety and necessity, endeavour to point out a few things in our Liturgy, which it would be well to correct or alter.

The word Liturgy, or more properly Leitergy, implies, as is generally known, "public service."* It was a term adopted by the early Christians, to indicate the combined worship of the people, when they assembled in their Ecclesia or Church, which was held at first in private houses, and then in public edifices. Several of these compositions are extant; some the productions of individuals, and others of synods or national bodies; and they are known by the name of St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, the Ambrosian, the Menonite, the Armenian, the Gallican, &c. Till the time of the Reformation, the English used the Roman Liturgy in their Churches; but in the reign of Edward VI. a new one was composed, strictly national, and appropriated to the service of the Church of England; and this composed in the year 1547, and published in black letter, is that which we use at the present day with some alteration. When first published, it bore all the stamp of the times, and retained much of the superstition of the exploded doctrines—the use of extreme unction, prayers for the dead, and what seemed to be an acknowledgment of the real presence. The form of baptism was an exorcism, and supposed that an unclean spirit actually possessed the young persons before the ceremony; it was as follows: "Then let the priest, looking on the children, saie, I command thee, uncleane spirite, in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the Holie Ghost, that thou come out and depart from these Infantes," &c. These and similar remnants of the Church of Rome were strongly condemned by Calvin and others at the time. The work was revised by Bucer, and these objectionable parts left out. As the minds

* The word is composed of *leitros* publicus, and *εργον* opus.

of men became more enlightened on these subjects, and times and opinions changed, the book underwent other revisions. It was again altered in the reign of Elizabeth, again in the reign of James I., and finally by Charles II. in 1661, at which time an act passed, engaging every person of the Established Church to use and observe it in the form then given to it. Since that time, many applications have been made for another revision, but without effect.

Of all periods of the English history, that, perhaps, was the most inauspicious for the production of any moral or religious composition, which should be binding on the faith and practice of posterity; yet so it is, that the Liturgy of that infidel and profligate time is the one now prescribed to us; and the coarse and faulty language of that day is the phraseology used in our churches, notwithstanding the mutations and improvements which a lapse of 169 years has introduced into every other place.

In order that the exceptionable parts may be more obvious, I will class them under heads, and begin with the Language. Of all imperfections to which such a composition is liable, one of the greatest, perhaps, is obscurity or ambiguity. There should be no word used that was not clearly and distinctly understood by the congregation, otherwise it is liable to the charge of praying in an unknown tongue, or of mistaking the nature and object of the matter. Many words which, nearly two centuries ago, were in common use, and perfectly intelligible, have now so changed their meaning as to alter their original sense. Formerly the word "of" was used as a sign of the instrument or means, or was synonymous with "from." Hence, in Clarke's Introduction to Latin, rules are given for its use; when put for "about," or "concerning," it is made by "de;" for "from," by "a" or "de," &c. Use, however, has latterly confined it to signify "about," or "concerning," and to apply it in any other sense is obscure. In the Gospel for the first Sunday after Epiphany, "being warned *of* God" means being warned *by* God; but according to our present acceptance of the word, it would signify "being warned of something *about* or *concerning* God;" and so I know it has been misunderstood in this and sundry similar passages. In the same manner, "after" implied "according to." In our Liturgy we say, "deal not with us after our sins;" which, in our present acceptance of words, mean "have no dealing with us after we have committed sin," a mistake of the most serious importance. In the same way, "reward" is put for "punishment."

In the Rubric for the Funeral Service, it is directed that the priest "and *clerks* shall meet the corpse, and at the grave shall say or sing," &c. These clerks were the *clerici*, or assistant clergy, who with tapers and other ceremonies, attended the funeral, as as at this day in Catholic countries. As this usage is not known or recognized in our Church, and a funeral is seldom or never attended by more than one officiating clergyman, many persons always suppose the word here meant the dif-

ferent *parish clerks*; but it never was intended so. According to universal and constant usage in our Church, the direction of "priest and clerks," which is evidently absurd, should be "priest and laity."

Formerly the word "Ghost" signified precisely the same thing as Spirit, and was synonymous with it, implying the immaterial, set in opposition to the material being; and in different parts of the Liturgy we use the adjective in the same sense. Thus we say "ghostly counsels," and "ghostly dangers," meaning such counsels and dangers as affect not the body, but the soul. The term "ghost," however, in common usage, has long since been confined to the appearance of something in a bodily shape, and is synonymous with spectre. Retaining the word, therefore, in our present acceptation, when we speak of the third person of the Trinity, is as rude as it is incorrect. The original Greek is πνεῦμα ἅγιον, not the Holy *Ghost*, as we now understand the term, but literally the Holy Spirit. It is said in Genesis, where the same word πνεῦμα is used by the Septuagint, that "The Spirit of God moved upon the surface of the waters." How absurd, not to say profane, it would sound, were we here to substitute our translation, and say, "The *Ghost* of God moved upon the surface of the waters?" Again, it is said in John,† "When he, the Spirit of Truth is come." How inexcusable would it be to render the passage, "When he, the Ghost of Truth is come?" and yet, to be consistent, we ought to do so, for it is the same word in the original, and there is no reason why we should not so use it in the translation. It is the same word which we still disguise under such different forms; though, I believe, every other sect of Christians have rejected the rude and improper terms, "ghost" and "ghostly," and every where substituted the more correct and intelligible words, "spirit" and "spiritual."

The pronouns "that" and "which" are used in an uncouth and obsolete manner. 'Tis true that our ancestors once used the latter as a personal relative, but for a century its relation has been confined to things; and therefore to say, "Our Father which," &c. seems to the congregation very ungrammatical.

In the Gospel for the Thursday before Easter, taken from the 23d chapter of Luke, is the following passage: "And there were also two other malefactors led with him to be put to death." Surely nothing can be more improper than such an expression, or more blasphemous than the error into which it would lead those who understood the passage literally, and in our present use of it; confounding the sinless and immaculate Son of God with wicked men, and supposing him also to be, like them, a malefactor, or doer of evil deeds. This is the reading in the Liturgy now before me, printed for J. Reeves, one of the patentees in 1804; though I

* "Καὶ πνεῦμα οὐ Θεοῦ ἐκφύετο ἐκάνω τοῦ ὕδατος."—Gen. i. 2.

† "ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνο τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας."—John, xvi. 13.

believe the error has undergone, in some editions, an attempt at correction, by a comma, where the passage is "two other, male-factors."

In our Baptismal Service we say, "crucify the old *man*,"—an expression evidently inapplicable, and even improper when applied to females.

In the Communion Collect we say, "*prevent* us, O Lord, in all our doings," and in the Collect for Easter Day, "by thy special grace *preventing* us," which are misunderstood by the majority of the congregation, who know nothing of their primitive Latin signification, and annex no meaning to the word but "hinder, or stop us."

In a similar way we use the word "let" in the Collect for the 4th Sunday in Advent, which, though synonymous there with the meaning we annex to "prevent," has a meaning at the present day totally opposite, and implies to "permit." It is true that this, and other words, are still heard on the stage, in Shakespeare and his contemporaries, in the same meaning as in our Liturgy; but I beg to suggest that there is some difference between the congregation of a church and the audience of a theatre, and it is somewhat more important for us to understand our prayers than our plays. To these may be added the passage in the Morning Lesson for the 21st. of July, "Who did sin, this man or his father, that he was born blind?" And in the Evening Lesson for the 18th of May, "When they arose in the morning, they were all dead corpses." The ambiguity of the expressions gave an air of almost absurdity to the passages, and the scoffer sneers at the books in which they are found, though they are mere errors of translation, and chargeable only on the loose and incorrect language of our forefathers.

We say, in the Apostles' Creed, that "Christ descended into hell;" and the congregation, who know no other meaning for the word, at the present day, but that of a place of eternal punishment, receive it here in the sense in which they take it in the parable of Lazarus and the rich man, and suppose that our Saviour actually went down to the place of the damned, triumphed over Satan in his own kingdom, and liberated "the spirits" then "in prison." But surely this is not the doctrine of our Church, but one that we exploded, among others, at the Reformation. Bishop Burnet, in his "Exposition," has given no less than four meanings to this very obscure and ambiguous article, and concludes that hell here is synonymous with *hades*, and means only that the soul of Christ was separated from his body, and remained in the invisible place of spirits, like that of other human natures. It does not come within my design to enter into any description of these points, but surely, if such be the doctrine of our Church, we should substitute "*hades*," or some other word, for "hell;" or if it still be an unsettled point, omit the article altogether which has given rise to so much doubt and error.

Another ambiguity in our creed is the word "Catholic" Church. In the present state of things, with other professors of Christianity, it gives rise to mistake and controversy, as it is claimed exclusively by one sect, and by a certain concession of long usage, always applied to them. There can be no reason for not substituting in its place the perfectly synonymous, and more used and intelligible term "Universal Church."

The last I shall mention is "damnation" in our Communion Service. The term, as it is generally understood, means condemnation to eternal punishment; but it is clear that in this place it intends no such thing. The visitations on unworthy communicants, as mentioned by the Apostle, were merely temporal, and our Church never meant to express more; yet what anxiety and misconception has the expression occasioned to people of timid and tender consciences, and surely should be altered to "condemnation."

Next to ambiguity of language, our Liturgy is chargeable with useless redundancy in the composition; and two or more perfectly synonymous words are used to express the same idea. Dr. Johnson has been accused of a similar fault, but without reason. Wherever his language seems redundant, it will be found that every additional expletive, or substantive, has a separate meaning, distinct from and stronger than the other; so that every such sentence is a climax. But this is not observed in the composition of our Liturgy. In the exhortation, we say "acknowledge and confess," "humble and lowly," "assemble and meet together;" in the confession we say, "erred and strayed;" in the Third Collect in Advent, "prepare and make ready;" in the Fifth, "let and hindered;" in the Collect for Innocent's Day, "mortify and kill;" in the prayer for the King, "vanquish and overcome;" and in sundry other places similar faults of composition might be adduced, where tautology and a superfluity of words perfectly synonymous, encumber the style, and sense is almost lost in sound. It may be said that such verbal faults, as they lead to no error, are perfectly harmless. This is very true, yet it is no reason why they should not be corrected. When we address an earthly superior, we are anxious to clothe our ideas in the best and most polished language which usage has adopted; shall we evince less respect to the Deity, and address him in the uncouth and negligent phraseology which deference for our fellow creatures has induced us to alter and improve?

But a still more serious charge against the language is its exceeding coarseness. In many passages which occur in our Church Service, we adopt expressions which could not be used in ordinary society.

* * * * *

Of the second kind are the passages which occur in some of the Lessons taken from the Old Testament. In the First Lesson, Morning Service for April 11; in the First Lesson, Morning Service for

the 5th of May; First Lesson, Evening Service for May 13; in the First Lesson, Morning Service, May 18; and on other occasions such expressions as the following occur: * * *

In the early translations of the Bible, many passages used in our Church Service were subsequently altered, because of objectionable language. Thus in the Second Evening Lesson for 1st January, 1st May, and 31st August, Paul was called a "knave of Jesus Christ;" but as the term "knave" had entirely altered its meaning, and gave rise to strange misconceptions, it was very properly changed to "servant," which implies the same thing now as "knave" did then. In the same way, in the Morning Lesson for the 3d of January, and Sexagesima Sunday, was found the passage, "And they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves breeches," which was afterwards, for its coarseness, altered to "aprons." Surely such examples are abundant precedents for us to improve the language of our Church at the present day, where the propriety is more obvious, and the necessity much greater.

It is generally and justly complained by the congregation, that our Service is too long, and this arises from two causes; one, that several services are now combined in one; and the other, that several parts of each service is several times repeated. With respect to the first, our present Liturgy consists of three separate and distinct forms, the Morning Prayer, the Litany, and the Communion Service. Each of these by itself is a complete and compact body of worship; and both in matter, form, and quantity, admirably adapted for the purpose intended, without fatiguing the attention; but when they are combined together, they compose not only a very prolix service, but abound in "vain repetitions," which the highest authority directs us to avoid. In this way it sometimes happens that the Lord's Prayer is actually repeated eleven times in the course of the Morning Service, viz. the Morning Prayer, 2; Litany, 1; Communion, 1; before the sermon, 1; Churching, after First Lesson, 1; Baptism, do. 1; and when either 6th of Matthew or 11th of Luke is the lesson, 1; Sacrament, 1. In the evening, with baptism, churching, and sermon,

[NOTE].—We have placed asterisks in place of the observations which our correspondent has made on certain passages in our Liturgy, because we deem that he has rather severely animadverted on those coarsenesses of expression, which to modern refinement are incongruous. It is true that what was not the least offensive to our forefathers, who, perhaps, spoke less cautiously, because they thought less evil, may pain modern ears; yet we think our correspondent makes too much of the matter; and while we deem that it is not the really delicate and pure-minded that are offended, yet we will allow, that at the proper season, and by proper hands, a new translation, or rather an emendation of the old version, might be made, and also a correction of our Liturgy, which was never put forward as a perfect work.—ED.]

it occurs five times; so that it is sometimes repeated in the same day, by the same persons, fourteen times. The "Gloria Patri" is said three times in the Morning Prayer, once in the Litany, once after each psalm; and on the 27th day of the month, when there are seven psalms, it is repeated eleven times. The King is prayed for three times in the Litany, Communion, and concluding prayer. It is surely impossible that the attention can be duly kept awakened in a service so long, or the impression not be enfeebled by the constant and "vain repetition" of the same things and words.

But the most serious charge brought against our Liturgy, and for which unfortunately there is some foundation, is *uncharitableness*; and this is the more to be regretted, as it is so repugnant to the meek and tolerant spirit which generally pervades the doctrines of our Church. In the prayer in time of war and tumults, we treat whoever happens to be our enemy with an apparent rancour and arrogance very inconsistent with the precepts of our Divine Master. We pray that "He will abate their pride, and assuage their malice;" as if pride and malice were exclusively chargeable on them, and we ourselves were perfectly free from such passions. If such language was admissible at all, it should include us both, and be "*our* pride and *our* malice," which are so frequently exerted on such occasions, by us as well as by our neighbour, and as often the cause of the commencement and continuation of war and tumults.

In a similar spirit are the expressions in the service for the 5th of November. "Popish treachery," and "hellish malice of Popish conspiracy," seem very exceptionable language to be used in a Christian Church, and applied to designate six or seven millions of our fellow Christians, countrymen, and fellow-subjects. It is true that this service was composed at a period when the minds of men were heated with contending passions, and Christian charity, "the bond of peace," was altogether forgotten in mutual enmity. As passion subsided, however, it fell into disuse with all moderate men, and latterly the day has been forgotten, and the appointed service omitted, in the majority of our Churches. But it is particularly desirous now that the service should be altogether expunged from our Prayer-books. Since the Legislature has thought fit to abolish all distinctions between the several classes of his Majesty's subjects, every painful or irritating reminiscence which would keep it alive should be abolished also.

In the Rubric for the burial of the dead it is directed, that the funeral service shall not be read over those "who die unbaptized, excommunicate, or who lay violent hands on themselves." With respect to the first, a person has no controul over his baptism, as the ceremony, in our Church, is performed in infancy; nor could the parties themselves, generally speaking, affirm, before their death, whether they were actually baptized or not—still less those who attend his funeral. The only means of knowing would be to consult the Parish Registry, where he was born, which is frequently *not* the place where he died, and consequently not acces-

able. It is therefore useless, not to say uncharitable, to continue a prohibition for a reason which cannot be ascertained, and which, if even proven, ought not to affect the individual, who had no control over it. With respect to the second, excommunication is a ceremony disused in our Church as a punishment or prevention of sin. It is never denounced, I believe, except against those who do not pay the costs of an ecclesiastical suit in which they may be engaged, and then it is read by the clergyman from the communion table. To denounce a worthy man in this way, before the congregation, in the house of God, because he may not have paid his attorney's or proctor's bill, seems a practice sufficiently exceptionable; but to carry the punishment to the grave, and deny his body the rites of Christian sepulture, is as indecent as it is unjust. On the third cause of inhibition I would speak with great diffidence. There is no doubt that every thing which the laws of man could devise should be called in to aid the laws of God against self murder; but it seems very doubtful whether its utmost severity would produce any effect. The wretched being to whom life is no longer tolerable, and who casts it away as an insupportable burden, will not be induced to bear it by refusing him the rights of burial after the deed is done. He that despises "the Almighty's canon against self-slaughter," will not be deterred by the petty discipline of man's enactment. We cannot deter the suicide, and only stigmatize his surviving and unoffending relatives. It was first the practice to drive a stake into the body, and bury it at cross roads; and many of these dismal memorials are still to be seen in the remote parts of England. The stake has been for many years disused, as a brutal and disgusting practice, but exclusion from the churchyard has continued. The legislative power, considering this also useless as well as barbarous, have abolished it by Act of Parliament, and a suicide is now buried, like other people, in the common receptacle of the dead. I submit with great diffidence, whether the inhibition of the funeral service, which is not for the dead, but for the living, should not be also omitted in our Rubric.

The last exceptionable portion of the liturgy which I shall advert to is the creed of St. Athanasius. It is unnecessary to state what is so generally known, that this composition was not written by the person whose name it bears, nor at the period when he lived. It is not to be found among his genuine works, and no notice is taken of it, nor is it quoted by any ecclesiastical writer, till 1000 years after the birth of Christ; and, finally, it never was sanctioned by any council. Nevertheless, it is a part of our liturgy, and the Rubric enjoins it to be read thirteen times in every year. Now, though the congregation may be, and are convinced, that the doctrines of this creed are founded on the full authority of Scripture, yet to attempt to explain them in a manner so minute and particular, and to affirm that "without doubt all shall perish everlastingly who do not believe a number of incomprehensible propositions," not in the form in which

they are to be found in Scripture, but in that which they are placed by some human and anonymous authority, very naturally shocks and alarms the greater part of every congregation in our churches. Even were it not so, why should our liturgy enter into controversial points, which may offend some, and exclude others? Surely, it is not a duty to publish our system of polemic divinity, every time we worship God. All difference on minute points may be compromised by silence, and no doctrine which in its own nature is unconnected with devotion, should be mixed up with prayer. The admirable Apostle's Creed includes only such divine truths as every Christian may join in. Why should we introduce into our service any thing which repels a Christian brother. In the Nicene Creed, drawn up at the Council of Nice, in 325, there was an anathematizing clause against those who said "there was a time when the Son of man was not." In adopting this creed, our Church very properly left out that clause. Surely, it must be but consistent to leave out the still more exceptionable damnatory clauses in the Athanasian Creed also, if it be not deemed expedient to omit the creed altogether.

But, in fact, the whole composition is of such a character, that it has drawn down the marked disapprobation of some of the most learned and exemplary prelates of our church. Horsey, Bishop of St. Asaph; Tomline, Bishop of Lincoln, and others, firm supporters of the Protestant faith, have expressed their censure very strongly. The latter says—"It is certainly to be lamented, that assertions of so peremptory a nature, unexplained, unqualified, should have been used in any *human* composition; our church would have acted more wisely, and more consistently, if it had *not* adopted the damnatory clauses. I cannot but conceive that it is both unnecessary and presumptuous to say, *without doubt* we shall perish everlastingly;"* and Archbishop Tillotson goes further and says, "I wish the church was well rid of it."† But the prelate who took the most decided part on the subject was an Irish Bishop who had been a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin. In the year 1756, Robert Clayton, Bishop of Clogher, made a motion in the Irish House of Lords to have this creed expunged from our liturgy."

But while we exclude by this uncharitable creed, many who are really joined to us in Christian fellowship and communion, we receive and recognise others who have long since been rejected by every Protestant assembly. In the calendar prefixed to our liturgy, to point out the times and persons which we ought to hold in respect and veneration, is to be found a multitude of obscure and exploded saints and martyrs, almost as numerous as those in the Greek or Catholic Church, who have days dedicated to their

* Christ. Thol., vol. ii. p. 220—222.

† Letter from Lambeth.

service. What have we to do with the following personages:—Ethelreda; Crispin, Martyr; Leonard, Confessor; Martin B.; Britina, B.; Machutus; Hugh, B.; Edmund, K. and M.; Cecilia, Virg. and Mart.; Clement; Catharine, Virg.; Nicholas, Bishop; Lucy, V. and M.; O. Sapientia; Sylvester; Hilliary, Bishop; Lucian, P.; Prisca, V.; Fabian, B.; Agnes, V.; Vincent, M.; Blascus, B. and M.; Agatha, Virg.; Valentine, B., Chad, B.; Perpetua, Gregory, M. and B; Edw. K. of W, Saxons; Benedict; Richard; Ambrose; Alphe, A. B.; Dunstan, A. B.; Augustine, A. B.; Bede, Pr.: Nicomede; Boniface, B.; Alban, M.; Francis Martin, B.; Swithin; Margaret; St. Anne; Lammass; Giles, A.; Eunurchus; Lambert; Cyprian; Jerome; Remigues; Edw. Confessor. We have besides, St. George for England, St. David for Wales, St. Denis for France, St. Andrew for Scotland; but by some strange exclusion, St. Patrick for Ireland is not admitted into this company. That nothing might be wanting, however, we receive into our calendar the “invention or finding of the Cross,” and consecrate a silly legend of the Greek Church, by dedicating a day to its memory. Without meaning any disrespect to those who recognise such persons and things, I perceive it would be but proper that we who do not, should exclude them from our prayer books, and no longer encumber them “with Eremites and Friars, white, black, and grey, with all their trumpery.”

In thus venturing to point out some of those things which I think might be the subject of alteration in our liturgy, I have certainly omitted others, which, however objected to by many, are matters of too grave importance to be lightly entertained. I do not hazard an opinion on the article that “good works have the nature of sin,” or the declaration of the Clergyman in the visitation of the sick—“I absolve thee from all thy sins”—or any other passages which involve the effectual doctrines of our Church. These I consider as corner stones, laid in the very foundation of our profession of faith, and not to be stirred without endangering the whole edifice; but such as I have ventured to point out in the composition of our Liturgy, are the perishable and decaying plaister, and but trash, which may and ought to be removed or repaired, as circumstances may render it necessary

Already has it undergone alterations, by ourselves in former times, and even at the present day by others who use it. In the year 1786, our liturgy underwent a revision in America, and several very judicious improvements were made. The vain repetitions of the Lord's Prayer and the Gloria Patri were corrected; the exceptionable expressions in the *Te Deum* were altered; the descent into hell left out in the creed; Catholic changed for universal; “seventh day substituted for Sabbath;” “with my body I thee worship” left out in the marriage ceremony, with the other coarse expressions, &c. It is earnestly to be wished that the subject will at length be taken into consideration here also, and our excellent liturgy purged from the errors of the time and

circumstances under which it was composed; and particularly in that improvement which all our institutions are undergoing, become, as it might and ought to be, a perfect model for such a composition. "Notwithstanding," said the excellent Paley, in his day, "that dread of innovation be the panic of the age, few could be displeased with such abridgments and alterations as the union of so many persons may require."

A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

[NOTE.—We have inserted the above article out of respect to the hand from which we have received it, and because that with many observations from which we dissent, there are in it some remarks deserving of attention. We are no enemies to reform, either in the formularies or the discipline of our Church, but would fain see it come from the Clergy, the best qualified for, and the most interested in the work, and protest against any changes in either, emanating from a lay legislature, or a lay constituted Commission. We do not think the author of this paper has exhibited as much good taste in his proposed changes as he has good intentions. The language of devotion should not be familiarised to the standard of that of common life, though undoubtedly it should be intelligible, and the addition of a few rubrics, explanatory of words and phrases, where their omission or change would not be desirable, could not be objected to. Our correspondent entirely mistakes the meaning and object of the Athanasian Creed; it is not an attempt to EXPLAIN the doctrines contained in it minutely and particularly, but is merely a statement of what they are, drawn up so as to avoid the neighbouring errors; and if "our Liturgy does not enter upon controversial points, which may offend some," we fear public prayer must merge into the unbreathed devotion of each individual member, or be deprived of every thing peculiar to the style of Gospel truth. His denunciation, too, against the Saints of our Calendar is quite unnecessary, as the least inspection of it would show. We have omitted a note of the author, in which Bishop Clayton, the generally recognised author of the *Essay on Spirit*, is termed "a martyr to his conscientious scruples;"—the victim of scruples he certainly was; and had these scruples directed him to resign a situation of emolument and dignity, at the same time that they urged him to impugn the doctrines of his Church, we would add, too, an honest victim.—ED.]

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Repeal of the Union. Extinction of Church Establishment. No Faith to be kept with Heretics. A Letter to Daniel O'Connell, Esq. M.P., by the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee.—Dublin: Moore Tims, Grafton-street, 1834. James Nisbet, London.

Ever since the Lateran Council decreed that oaths taken with heretics might be broken, those whom the Church of Rome has pleased to denounce as such, have been justly fearful of the stability of all oaths and solemn compacts made by a professor of the Roman creed, and more especially so, when its Divines and Doctors are so careful to announce, time after time, that their Church is unchanged and unchangeable.

That solemn treaties and holy oaths have been violated; that the Pope of Rome has given dispensations and absolutions to the oath-breaker, is most true. But it is also true, and for the honour of human nature let it be recorded, that thousands of persons, adhering, (we will not say with what consistency) to the creed of their forefathers, have, with uplifted hands, protested against this monstrous advantage, which a Papist was supposed to hold in reserve. But still, the Dissenters from the Church of Rome have, warned by the voice of history, clung to their apprehensions; and therefore, in all Protestant States, where Roman Catholics reside, and desire, not only privileges, but equal civil immunities, they have endeavoured to satisfy their fellow-citizens that they neither could, in conscience, or would, in fact, violate any solemn and religious engagement they entered into. And they have resorted to their Universities, and got the Doctors of Sorbonne, Louvaine, and Salamanca, &c., &c. to pronounce that the principle of not keeping faith with heretics was not to be imputed to them; and that any one who did so, inflicted an injurious calumny on their moral and religious character.

Protestants rejoiced that such solemn renunciations were made; and, trusting to the seeds of con-

science implanted in every human breast, they relied more on human nature than they feared Romanism; and when they admitted the Roman Catholics into the full benefits of the British Constitution, they took a solemn oath from the Romish senator that he "disclaimed, disavowed, and solemnly abjured any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, as settled by law within this realm;" and they made him solemnly swear "that he would never exercise any privilege to which he was, or might become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant Religion, or Protestant Government of the United Kingdom." It was natural to suppose that Roman Catholic gentlemen, aware of the suspicion attached to the members of their creed for three centuries, would have been sensitively careful in observing the *letter* and *spirit* of their oath, and therefore, for the honour of their church, as well as for their character as gentlemen, they would have abstained from tampering with their engagement.

Has that been the case? Yes, certainly; to the credit of *some* high-minded Roman Catholic peers and gentlemen, they have allowed that they felt their oath's obligation; but has it been so with the Irish agitator and his tail? This letter of Mr. M'Ghee puts the whole affair in the strongest light before the public; and while the historian holds a pen, or while a book passes from hand to hand, it will be recorded how Roman Catholic gentlemen, in the full spirit of those who sat at the Lateran, Constance, and Sienna Councils, could tamper with the obligations of an oath.

All our readers must be aware that Mr. O'Connell, in order to carry his avowed object of Repealing the Union, has addressed letters to the Protestant laity of Ireland; conscious that they are the great stumbling blocks in his way; and that as they have been, so they still

are, the great connecting link that binds Ireland to England; he endeavours to wheedle them into a consent to his measure. It is in answer to those letters of the agitator that Mr. M'Ghee has written this pamphlet before us, which has already appeared in the public papers, and we believe, at an expense which few individuals possessing sees and benefices would venture on, this unbeneficed clergyman has paid the Popish papers largely for its admission into their columns.

Mr. M'Ghee, in answer to the agitator's assertion that the Repeal of the Union would promote Christian benevolence and universal charity, conciliation, peace, and perpetual harmony, thus speaks:—

“I shall not affect to enter at large on the question of a Repeal of the Union. I take one point of it, and on that I say, that no Protestant who knows any thing of the character of Popery, could for a moment unite with you in an attempt to obtain a Repeal. At the time when Protestants spoke in the terms which you quote, of a domestic legislature, that legislature was then composed of Protestants—there was no intolerant superstition so overwhelm them with its numbers, or oppress them with its persecutions. In the Imperial Parliament, however baneful and powerful your influence against our religion, you feel you are still in a minority, and still must be so; and although the British Legislature has disgraced itself as bearing the name of Christian, by its concession to you, in abandoning the Word of God, and by the lengths it has gone in its invasion of the Protestant Church, still you know that there is a point at which it must come to a pause, short of utter extinction of our liberty, alienation of our property, and persecution, perhaps, of our life. We may suffer, and we may be galled under the yoke of the British Legislature, but the little finger of Popery is heavier than the loins of her law. A Repeal of the Union, to the Protestants of Ireland who dared to cling to their religion, would be setting up

a national dynasty of persecuting priests and tyrannizing demagogues, who, instead of merely embittering our existence with agitation and sedition, would overwhelm us with the arm of inquisitorial despotism; and the only liberty it would give to the country would be a liberty to superstition of enslaving religion, and to priestcraft of rivetting its chains, in hopeless bondage upon the consciences and the immortal souls of the Roman Catholics of Ireland.”

Again he says—“Sir, I say it is the influence of that demoralizing superstition that, in the hands of interested disturbers of the public peace, kindles and keeps alive all the worst passions, and cultivates the vices of the human heart—which trains up the population in ignorance, and sin, and misery, and leaves them to perish in the ruin it has entailed upon them—therefore liberty, and property, and life are insecure—therefore the Protestant proprietor turns in disgust from the soil—therefore the English capitalist would rather venture his all across the mountain billows of the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans—he would rather brave the burning of the line, or the freezing of the pole, than cross the little channel that divides us from his shore, with all the advantages of soil, of situation, of labour—with all the facilities of nature in his favour, to endure the hardships and the hazards of property and life, attendant on a speculation in lawless, convulsed, superstitious and miserable Ireland.

“And what would a Repeal of the Union do for this? Would it give principle and morals to those who are still sunk in that superstition that has corrupted and subverted both? Would it heal the wound which it was the increasing interest of demagogues and priests to tear open? Would it arrest the course of agitation, when the immediate possession of political ascendancy was held out as a premium on its progress—when it would be a struggle, foot to foot, for power between that body that possess the property of the country, and those who aim

at its possession? Would the English capitalist venture his speculation in a country too convulsed and too hot for its inhabitants? Would a man go to build at the foot of a volcano, whose eruptions continually overwhelm whatever is erected on its confines? A Repeal of the Union would increase the thirst of power and of persecution in the demagogue and in the priest, but I know of no benefit it would confer on the Roman Catholic population, but to enable you still to prey on their credulity—to amuse them with the name of freedom, while you rivetted the chains of their slavery—to delude them with the sound of deliverance from the dominion of others, that you might with greater facility exercise an uninterrupted despotism over them yourself—that you might tax them for your purse, and trample on them for your ambition.”

But let us come to the great subject of this able pamphlet, the oath of a Roman Catholic senator: and thus Mr. McGhee proceeds:—

“Sir, you call upon the Protestants of Ireland to trust you in that very document, in which, in the most flagrant violation of your solemn oath that man has ever dared to publish to the world, you tell them it is your principle and your object to put down the establishment of their religion. You have too long insulted the morals, the religion of Christians on this subject, Sir, but you shall no longer do so with impunity.

“As a member of Parliament, and to entitle you, under the existing law, to take your seat, you, after some other items, make the following oath:—

“‘I do swear that I will defend, to the utmost of my power, the settlement of property within this realm, as established by the laws; and I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, as settled by law within the realm; and I do solemnly swear that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become

entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the United Kingdom; and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever. So help me God.’

“These, Sir, are the words of your oath. Now, I have two letters of yours before me, one to your constituents, dated September 11, 1833, the other to the Protestants of Ireland, dated the 14th of last December. Let us compare these with your oath.

“In the former you say—

“‘I do claim some merit for my exertions to abolish tithes; I want to have them *totally abolished*, not in name merely, but in substance and reality. ‘*DELENDA EST ECCLESIA.*’ This is my maxim as to tithes; they must be abolished; on Ireland never will, never can, never ought to be tranquil; the tranquillity of Ireland depends mainly on the total and immediate abolition of the tithe system, root and branch, composition, and valuation; and all; the tithe system must go, root and branch. My principle is—the principle of my public life is—that no one Christian should be compelled to contribute to the support of a Church to which he does not belong, or of a religion from which he dissents.’

“‘This is the principle to be taken up with ardour, and supported with constancy, every man to support his own religion—no man to be compelled to support another man’s clergyman, any more than he is another man’s lawyer or doctor.’ Again—‘The passive resistance of the last year was a magnificent spectacle—doing honour to the heads that conceived, and to the hearts that boldly persevered in that system. The time is, however, come for more active and energetic measures—the time is come to enable the people of Ireland peaceably, legally, and constitutionally, to get

rid for ever of the abomination of tithes.' This is your letter to your constituents, of September 11.

"In your letter to the Protestants of Ireland, on the 14th of December, you say—

"But there is one subject of vital importance, upon which it is necessary we should first understand each other; and the difficulty of treating it, so as to prevent irritation and produce harmony, is, perhaps, much greater than even its importance—I mean the *Protestant Church Establishment*."

"On this subject, above all others, should we distinctly understand one another,' &c.

"The principle I go upon is this, that no one Christian should be compelled to contribute to the support of any religion which he believes not to be true: that is, in other words, that no person of one sect or persuasion should be compelled to contribute to the maintenance of the ministers of any other sect or religion."

"This is explicit; it goes to the very root of the temporalities of the *Protestant Establishment*. I am decidedly for taking away those temporalities; for extinguishing a great part of them, such as the tithe, and for employing the remainder to other public purposes."

"Now, Sir, I believe there are thousands of Roman Catholics in Ireland, who, though brought up in the forms of the same superstition in which you have been educated, are not infected with the same contamination of some of its appalling principles—I believe there are thousands of them who have a solemn sense of the sacred obligation of an oath—I believe there are thousands of them who would consider not only their oath inviolable, but their word as inviolable as an oath."

"Now, I call on them, as men of truth and principle—as men of honor and integrity—to compare your letters and your conduct with your oath."

"You solemnly swear, that you will defend, to the utmost of your power, the settlement of property within this realm, as established by

the laws; and, in the teeth of your oath, so far from defending, you publicly praise the men who have, by every possible means, both what is called passive resistance and active resistance, eluded and opposed the collection of the property of the Irish Church, which as yet is settled by the laws. Your quibble, which I shall examine just now, that your oath does not hinder you from trying to procure an alteration in these laws, does not avail you here; for the laws are yet in being—the property is as yet settled by the laws; but, in the teeth of your oath, in which you swear you will defend it to the utmost of your power, you declare in the public address to your constituents, that 'the passive resistance of these laws, and this property, was a magnificent spectacle, doing honour to the heads that conceived, and the hearts that boldly persevered in that system.'

"You solemnly swear, in the midst of the British Senate, that, to the utmost of your power, you will defend this property, and you come over to Ireland to use your utmost efforts to stir up the people to subvert it."

"You will say, Sir, perhaps, that this did not mean Church property, that it was only intended to apply to the forfeited estates. Perhaps you will borrow Dr. Doyle's arguments as to the '*usufructuarii*,' to prove that tithe is no property at all. Well, Sir, let us grant this: we suppose you tried by a jury of Jesuits, and acquitted on this count of violating your oath. But what is the next head of it?"

"I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present *Church Establishment, as settled by law within this realm*; and I do solemnly swear that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government of the United Kingdom."

"Here, now, Sir, what loop-hole have you for your quibble, or what apology for your crime? I affirm that the first clause of this sentence

defines the nature of the property that is mentioned, which is *Church property*, which is both negatively and positively guarded by the oath; positively, in that you are sworn to defend it; negatively, in that you 'disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure,' not only words or acts, but even 'any intention to subvert it.'

"Mark, Sir, 'to subvert the *present Church Establishment*, as settled by law within this realm;' that establishment *then in present existence when you took the oath*. Yes, Sir, however galling to your principles, whatever was the 'evasion, or equivocation, or mental reservation,' with which you took that oath, I assert, and I defy all your talent, all your legal sophistry, all your powers of special pleading, to disprove it—I defy Dr. Doyle, and Dr. M'Hale, and all the College of Clongowes, to get you out of it."

But Mr. O'Connell has defended himself, in the public papers, against these imputations, as follows:—

"I had imagined that the very essence and excess of human arrogance and haughty presumption could not pervert the plain words of a plain oath into any engagement, express or implied, on the part of the Catholic members of Parliament, not to vote as their judgment might dictate, on the subject of tithes, cesses, oblations, first-fruits, Easter-offerings, dues, and pecuniary demands of the Established Church. I contemptuously deny that these things are '*religion*!' and I should despise Mr. Stanley's intellect and feelings if he things these, or any part of these, part and parcel of his '*religion*.'"

Being, as I am, the decided enemy of the tithe system, but its legal and constitutional enemy, I feel myself perfectly at liberty to procure, as soon as I can, a law for the total and unequivocal abolition of tithes and vestry cesses; I am as free to support such a law as Mr. Stanley is to oppose it, notwithstanding the froth, and fury, and gross calumnies attributed to him on this subject."

And Mr. McGhee replies thus:—"This, Sir, is your deliberate defence. Let us examine it. When you com-

plain so much, Sir, as to the charge of violating your oath, and when you talk with such decision of the '*plain words of a plain oath*,' it is rather singular that you do not quote those '*plain words*,' and plainly show that you do not plainly violate them; but you pick out one solitary word out of your oath, and that word is '*religion*,' and you lay beside it 'tithes, cesses, oblations, first-fruits,' &c., and you say, 'I contemptuously deny that these things are religion.' The sophism with which you seek to impose on the public, and which you wish to imply by your words, is this: 'I am only bound by my oath not to subvert the Protestant religion, but I deny that these things are '*religion*,' and therefore, in attacking them I do not violate my oath;' and thus you think not only that you blind the public as to your own crime, but that you throw the odium on any who attack you for it, of admitting that '*these things are a part and parcel of their religion*.'"

"Now, Sir, I deny as firmly as you do, 'contemptuously,' that these things are any part or parcel of the Protestant religion. If they were all in the bottom of the sea, the principles of the Protestant religion are as spotless and untouched as ever.

"But, Sir, while I deny that these things are any part or parcel of the Protestant religion, considered as a *religion*, I say, Sir, that these are not only a part but the whole of that which constitutes that religion the *Established Religion* of these realms. It is the fact that this property is by law annexed to the support of that religion that makes it the *Church Establishment*, and this fact has nothing to say to its principles. Take this property away, the present *Established Religion* has no longer any existence as such; give this property to another, and then that becomes the established religion. Therefore, though this property is no part of the religion, it is that which, being secured by the law to the Church, makes that religion to be established. It might be taken away from the Protestant religion without derogating any thing from its truth, and it might

be given to Popery without diminishing any thing from its falsehood, and the possession of the property would make either the Church Establishment.

"And now, Sir, while I defy your legal powers to refute this plain distinction, let me ask, what are 'the plain words of this plain oath?' They are these: 'I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, as settled by law within this realm; and I do solemnly swear that I never will exercise any privilege, to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the United Kingdom.'

"Now, Sir, I assert before all the law authorities in Ireland, that the only legal construction of those words, '*the present Church Establishment as settled by law*,' primarily includes the temporalities annexed and secured by law to the Protestant Established Church, by the legal security of which temporalities it is made the Established Religion of the land. The principle to which you are so solemnly pledged by that oath, is the principle not only of a *Church Establishment*, but of the *existing Church Establishment*. This you swear, without evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation, you have no intention of subverting. The principle which you now avow, both in your letter to your constituents, and in your letter to the Protestants of Ireland, is that of subverting not only the present Church Establishment, but any Church Establishment. You say, in your letter to your constituents, 'the principle to be taken up with ardour, and supported with constancy is, every man to support his own religion; no man to be compelled to support another man's Clergyman, any more than he is another man's Lawyer or Doctor.' You repeat this in your letter to the Protestants, and you say, 'you are decidedly for taking away the temporalities of the Church Establishment, for extinguishing a great part of them, such as the tithes, and devoting the remainder to other public purposes.'

"Now I say this avowed principle can no more co-exist in the same mind with the principle of your oath, than light and darkness can co-exist in the same spot. If you confess this to have been your principle, when you swore, on your own confession, you were violating your oath, even in the very act of taking it. If you say it has arisen in your mind and intention since, being still under the obligation of the oath, you are writing, speaking, and acting in violation of it to this day. Now, Sir, take '*the plain words of your plain oath*,' and the plain words of your plain letter, and reconcile them in the face of Ireland. Sir, you not only cannot do so, but you know you cannot; and therefore you do not dare to quote any of the '*plain words*' of this first clause of your oath, in your letter to the *Pilot*, but you seize on one word in the second clause, namely, '*Religion*,' which is the only one you venture to mention, and you imagine you silence all attack by your blustering assertion that property is not religion."

But the Roman Catholic senator may say, that he did not intend to take the oath in the sense that Protestants put upon it. On this subject two *warm* advocates thus holds forth:

"There is one principle in the consideration of an oath, which has hitherto obtained, in every nation, Heathen as well as Christian—among all those who have ever written on the nature of that sacred obligation—that principle is this: 'that an oath is to be taken in the sense which is intended by the person or persons who administer the oath, so that if the man who takes, takes or construes it by any mental evasion, equivocation, or reservation, in a sense different from that which he knows is meant by the persons to whom he swears, he is so far forth a perjured man.'

"I might cite various learned authorities on this subject, but I will content myself with one.

"Doctor Doyle, in the three chapters on oaths, in his address to Lord Liverpool, in 1826, in which he labours to vindicate your church from the charge of having no respect for

an oath, those chapters in which he tells us that—

“The charge is, indeed, so heinous, that he never reads even an indirect allusion to it, without feeling his indignation moved; and when forced to disclaim it, on taking the oath of allegiance prescribed to be taken by Catholics, the blood receded from his heart.”

“That address in which he reminds Lord Liverpool how *‘he took the liberty of suggesting, in his examination before his Lordship, how the collection of tithes in Ireland could be rendered less onerous and odious;’* in which he tells him, as a happy illustration of his principles and his sincerity, how he had declared, *‘upon his oath, that if the claims of Roman Catholics were granted, they would view the Clergy of the Established Church as brethren, labouring in the same vineyard with themselves, seeking to promote the interests of their common country.’*

“That address, which he closes with a declaration *‘upon oath,’* almost in the words of your own oath, *‘that he disclaims, disavows, and solemnly abjures any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, and that he will not exercise any privilege to which he is or may be entitled, to disturb and weaken the Protestant religion;’* which oath, according to the tenets of his Church, he has, like yourself, MOST RELIGIOUSLY observed.

“Well, Sir, in these same three memorable chapters on oaths, in this memorable address, Dr. Doyle quotes in Latin the words of St. Thomas and Isidorus, and then translates them for the benefit of those unaccustomed to the delusions of an unknown tongue.

“This, he says, my Lord, is the doctrine of Catholics, which they are obliged to hold, which it is not lawful for them to impugn, which it is a crime to depart from.” Then he translates—*‘An oath must be kept according to the meaning of him who administers it or to whom it is sworn. Whatever form of words may be used, however artfully they may be arranged, yet God, who is taken as a witness of*

the conscience, so understands the oath as he does to whom it is sworn, so that if it be eluded or violated, a twofold crime is committed: in other words, the name of God is taken in vain, and the neighbour is circumvented by fraud.’

“Now the question is this:

“Do you, Sir, or do you not, know that the meaning and intention of the Protestant Legislature, in framing that oath, which was to qualify you to be admitted as a member of that Legislature, (which oath you have voluntarily taken,) was to protect that property of the Church, those very temporalities which you now openly profess it is your object to extinguish?”

“Do you not know, Sir, when you swore that you had no intention of subverting the Church Establishment, as settled by law, that the Protestant Legislature meant—and expected, and believed that you meant—the property annexed and secured by the then existing laws for the maintenance of the Established Religion?”

“Do you not know, Sir, when you swore never to use any privilege which you might acquire as a member of Parliament, or in any office to which the Relief Bill made you eligible, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion, that the Protestant Legislature meant and intended, and believed that you meant and intended by that oath, the property of the Protestant Church, rather than, as you affect to insinuate, the principles of the religion?”

“When you were called on to swear that you took that oath in the plain and ordinary sense of the words, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, do you not know, Sir, that all species of false and unprincipled subterfuges, such, for example, as pretending that property was not religion, and that though you were not to disturb the principles of the religion, you might disturb, yea, totally subvert and extinguish the property of the Established Church—do you not know, I say, Sir, that such lying evasions as these were intended to be guarded against, and that you were supposed to swear in this that

you took the oath in the plain sense that the Protestant Legislature intended it?

"And now, Sir, I put this question on the meaning of your oath.

"I ask you, Sir, in the face of the Irish nation, of a society of civilized men, whose properties and lives are not secure, if perjury is to lift up her guilty, brazen front, and vindicate her crimes, and pursue her traffic with impunity?

"DO YOU NOT KNOW, SIR, THAT THESE WERE THE MEANING AND INTENTIONS OF THE PROTESTANT LEGISLATURE IN FRAMING THAT OATH?"

"If you confess you do know it, then, Sir, I say you are convicted, on your own confession, of being a violator of your oath, on the principle which I have stated, in which every Heathen as well as every Christian writer, and even the Jesuit himself, confesses the very essence of perjury consists; in that the person who takes the oath, breaks it in the sense of those who administered it.

"But, Sir, if you deny that this was the meaning and intention of the Protestant legislature, if you say that they only meant by that oath that you were not to interfere with the principles of the Established Church, but that you think they intended to leave you at liberty to attack, as you do, her property and her existence; and that you can do this either in or out of the Senate, without a violation of their meaning of your oath—if you will say this—do not say it, Sir, for there is not a man of principle, or truth, or honour, or common honesty in Europe, that will believe you; but if you will act consistently, swear it, Sir, and then—what then?"

Having thus boldly accused the agitator, he makes this manly appeal to the Roman Catholics of Ireland:

"And now, Sir, I appeal to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and I ask them, are they identified with you in this treachery or not? If they are, let them go on, let them contribute to your maintenance, and hold you up as their leader, as a man whom they choose to represent their principles, their integrity, and their religion. If not, let them

renounce you—let every honest man among them refuse to identify himself with an individual whose conduct goes to justify all that ever has been written against the corruption of the moral principles of the Church of Rome, and to prove that Doctor Doyle's attempt to vindicate her from the imputation of contempt for oaths, was but an aggravated instance of that treachery, which loudly disclaimed the crime, only to gain an opportunity for its effective perpetration."

We have given the above extracts from this important tract, with a view of calling the attention (as far as our publication can do) of the Protestants of the Empire to this important charge—a charge which goes mainly to show that the fears and accusations of our forefathers were not unfounded, and that as there existed, so there still exists, some principles and some means in the minds of many attached to the Church of Rome, of evading the obligations of an oath. One who lived and died within the pale of this church, the Rev. Charles O'Connor, in his letters of Columbanus, accused the priests and foreign-influenced politicians, who adhered to the Nuncio in the Rebellion of 1641, of being *FEDIFRAGI*; and he adduced many and deplorable instances of breaches of the most solemn engagements, whereby this unhappy Island was brought to desolation, and the people almost exterminated.

We have not heard that any known Catholic, either priest or layman, has attempted to answer Mr. M'Ghee. We believe that the charge hangs like a millstone about the neck of the great Agitator, and the consequence is that he, in order to enable him to work the final ruin of the Established Church in Ireland, without having this stern imputation of being an oath breaker cast in his teeth, has given notice of a motion in Parliament to have the existing oath of a Roman Catholic senator either totally abolished or so modified as to suit his purpose. Will the Protestants of the Empire submit to this? Will they not rouse as with one mind, and petition that this only safeguard to their Church, as an Establishment, may not be taken away?

Hymns for Childhood, by Felicia Hemans.—Dublin; Wm. Curry, Jun. and Co.; Simpkin and Marshall, London.

There is an abundance of Sacred poetry published; and almost every congregation has its peculiar book of hymns; in which there is, no doubt, some well modulated versification, and some very pious and evangelical thoughts: but, confessedly, these works show how, in most instances, the spirit of devotion can exist, and can stimulate a writer to versify, without his possessing any of the elements of genuine poetry. To be sure, James Montgomery and others have shown how well the waters of Siloam can mingle with those of Parnassus. But these happy coincidences form not the rule, but the exception. We have often wished

that Mrs. Hemans, the sweetest of modern female poets, whose touches of tenderness are so exquisite, and whose taste is so delicate, would dedicate her lyre to religion. In the present instance, she has gratified our desire, and these "*Hymns for Childhood*" abound with beauties; they are stamped with rich peculiarities of Felicia Hemans's mind, and are an acceptable present to those who love genuine religious poetry. They are very beautifully brought out, and the publishers, Messrs. Curry and Co. seem to have felt that they should not convey such gems except in a becoming casket; therefore, they give "apples of gold in pictures of silver."

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

DOMESTIC.

THE CHURCH FUND.—By the recent change, in consequence of the death of the Bishop of Limerick, the above fund will be increased by 3,654*l.* per annum, (besides the value of the See-house of Clonfert,) the income of Clonfert being 3,018*l.*, and the tax of seven per cent. per annum on Limerick, amounting to 346*l.*, and the like tax on Killaloe being 290*l.* per annum. In addition to this sum of 3,654*l.* a-year thus gained, the income of Waterford and Lismore, amounting to 4,110*l.* per annum, and the value of the See-house of Cashel, have been added to the same fund. Besides these, the See of Derry was, by the provisions of the Church Temporalities Bill reduced by 4,000*l.* per annum, and the remainder left to the See made chargeable with 416*l.* a-year, to take effect immediately. Thus, in little more than six months from the passing of the Bill, a revenue of upwards of 12,000*l.* per annum has fallen to the Church Fund by bishoprics alone.—*Limerick Chronicle*.

CHURCH CESS.—A grant of 10,000*l.* has been made by the Lords

of the Treasury, to be placed at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, for paying the Easter Vestry applotments, as regulated by the Irish Church Reform Bill.—*D. E. Post*.

GREAT BRITAIN.

POOR'S RATES.—From some official returns recently made up, it appears that the total amount of poor's rates raised in England and Wales, during the year ended March, 1832, was 8,622,920*l.* 4*s.*, being an excess of 343,712*l.* 10*s.* beyond the amount raised during the preceding year. The total amount of money expended for the relief of the poor, and not for other purposes, during the year 1832, was 7,036,968*l.* 10*s.*, being an increase of 238,979*l.* 11*s.* beyond the sum expended for the relief of the poor during the preceding year.

CHURCH OF ROME.—There is, indeed, one church which, wherever it has been established, has proved itself directly injurious, both to religious feeling and to civil liberty, because of the systematic, unremitting, and unblushing efforts of its ministers to

obtain, by the most revolting means, an absolute power over all ranks of men in their temporal and social relations. The Romish church (though all modes of faith must be *tolerated*) cannot be established any where without danger to those objects which other churches are calculated to promote, viz. the influence of law, good government, and morals.—*Times*.

We have much satisfaction in laying before our readers the following letter from the Lord Bishop of Exeter, addressed to the Venerable the Archdeacon of Cornwall, as it will correct the erroneous impression which has been produced in reference to the circumstance to which it relates:—

“Exeter, Dec. 31.

“Dear Mr. Archdeacon—Much publicity having been given to a recent refusal on my part to institute a clergyman presented to a living, because he declined submitting to an examination; and endeavours having been made to excite an apprehension that this is the commencement of a new and arbitrary practice, or at best a revival of an obsolete statute, for the purpose of drawing the patronage of livings to myself, I think it may conduce to the preservation of that confidence which I wish to subsist between my clergy and myself, if I inform, through you and your brother archdeacons, of the course which I have pursued, and shall continue to pursue, in this particular.

“It is simply this, to require examination of every person presented to me for institution, in whose case there appear to me grounds of apprehension that he is either unsound in doctrine, or deficient in those attainments which are necessary for the due performance of his sacred duties.

“Of the power thus exercised by me it cannot be necessary for me to remind you, or my clergy in general, that it is no novelty; that it does not rest on an antiquated statute, but is really of the very essence of the Episcopal Government; that it is, as such, part of the common law of the realm, and recognised to

be so by the statute which has been cited; that the canons of the Church of England expressly enforce it; that our highest courts of law respect and uphold it; that our books of law treat it as an ordinary and notorious practice.

“I am in hopes that my clergy will think that in my own feelings towards them, evinced in my intercourse with them during the last three years, they have a sufficient guarantee against the vexatious exercise of this or any other power belonging to my office. Be this, however, as it may, I am confident that few among them will expect, and not one will wish, that I shall be ‘partaker of other men’s sins,’ by wilfully or heedlessly consigning the most awful commission which men can receive, the cure of souls, to those of whom I may have reason to apprehend that they are incapable of discharging it faithfully and usefully.

“You will oblige me by communicating this letter to the clergy of your Archdeaconry, in any manner which you may judge best: for be assured that on this and all occasions it is my earnest wish to state plainly and explicitly, the rules by which I regulate my official conduct, and the reasons on which they are founded.

“I am, dear Mr. Archdeacon, your very faithful friend and brother,

“H. EXETER.

“To the Venerable the Archdeacon of Cornwall.”

The following quotations are from *Burn’s Ecclesiastical Law*, last edition:—

“From canon 39 it appears that no bishop shall institute to a benefice any one who hath been ordained by another bishop, unless on three conditions; the last of which is, that when he shall appear upon due examination to be worthy of his ministry.

“As to this matter of learning, it hath been allowed by the Courts of King’s Bench and Common Pleas, and also by the High Court of Parliament, that a clerk having been ordained, and so presumed to be of good abilities, neither takes away nor diminishes the right of the bi-

shop to whom the presentation is made to examine and judge.

"The most common and ordinary refusal is want of learning."—Page 153.

"If the clerk refused be the presentee of an ecclesiastical patron, he cannot afterwards present any one better qualified without the bishop's consent, and so the lapse becomes unavoidable.

"Examination is commonly had when application is made to the Archbishop to hold two livings."

These quotations are given for the purpose of pointing out the existing law. There is reason to believe that the examination proposed to the presentee of St. Erth was the same as had been demanded from, and acceded to by, another clergyman since the present bishop's accession to his see, and was explained to be much the same as that required of a candidate for priest's orders.

ECCLESIASTICAL CORPORATIONS.

An account of the Gross Amounts of Income of all Ecclesiastical Corporations in Ireland—such as Deans and Chapters, Vicar Choralships, and Minor Canonries; with observations relative to the Appropriation of the Annual Income, &c.

DEANS AND CHAPTERS.

Christ Church, Dublin. Gross income, 2,316*l.* 8*s.* 3*d.* Expenditure, 2,491*l.* 10*s.* 2*d.*, salaries to dignitaries, prebendaries, stipendaries, choristers, officers and servants, 1,582*l.* 9*s.* 7*d.*, and to extensive repairs, 828*l.* 12*s.* 2*d.*; the residue in sundries not classified; the surplus of the expenditure over the income was supplied by the sale of capital stock.

Kildare. Gross income, 600*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* Expenditure, 110*l.* 4*s.* 1*d.*, salaries and allowances, and extraordinary repairs; the residue, 490*l.* 8*s.* 5*d.*, divided among the eight members of the chapter in nearly equal shares.

Waterford. Gross income, 439*l.* 18*s.* 9*d.* Expenditure, 4*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.*, quit-rent; the residue, 435*l.* 12*s.* 5*d.*, divided among the dean and three dignitaries; the dean receiving one-

third, and the rest two-thirds of the corporate revenues.

Clonfert. Gross income, 889*l.* 17*s.* 3*d.* Expenditure, nil, the whole divided amongst the eleven members of the chapter.

Total gross income, 4,266*l.* 17*s.* 7*d.* Total gross expenditure, 2,600*l.* 2*s.*, the total amount of net income divided among the members of the chapters of Kildare, Waterford, and Clonfert, is 1,765*l.* 18*s.* 4*d.*

VICAR CHORAL'S ESTATES.

Armagh. Gross income, 875*l.* 8*s.* 8*d.* Expenditure, 1,125*l.* divided amongst vicars, choir-boys, stipendaries, and part appropriated to repairs; the amount of expenditure over income is 249*l.* 11*s.* 4*d.*; but from what source supplied does not appear.

Christ Church, Dublin. Gross income, 1,161*l.* 13*s.* 2½*d.* Expenditure, 1,126*l.* 0*s.* 9*d.*, among the vicars and choir-men.

Prebendaries and Vicars of Christ Church, Dublin. Gross income, 1,011*l.* 0*s.* 8½*d.* Expenditure, 994*l.* 1*s.* 10½*d.*, of which sum, 972*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.* was divided among the prebendaries and vicars; and the remainder, 22*l.* 0*s.* 4½*d.* reserved for other objects.

Vicars Choral of St. Patrick's, Dublin. Gross income, 1,974*l.* 13*s.* 5½*d.* Expenditure, 1,875*l.* 18*s.* 11½*d.* among the vicars; 82*l.* 11*s.* 4½*d.*, among the choir-boys, and for other expenses.

Ossory. Gross income, 230*l.* Expenditure, 180*l.*, among the vicars; 40*l.* among the curates.

Cashel. Gross income, 533*l.* 19*s.* 10*d.* Expenditure, 342*l.* 6*s.* 2*d.*, among the vicars; the residue unaccounted for, with the exception of the expenses of collection; 54*l.* 13*s.* 10*d.* among the curates.

Lismore. Gross income, 745*l.* 14*s.* Expenditure, 575*l.* 13*s.* 9*d.*, among the vicars; 170*l.* among the curates and schoolmaster.

Cork. Gross income, 1,558*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* Expenditure, 1,221*l.* 7*s.* among the vicars; 337*l.* 4*s.* 6*d.* among the choir, reader, and curate.

Ross. Gross income, 450*l.* Expenditure, 350*l.* to one vicar choral; 86*l.* 16*s.* 4*d.* to curate, reader, and schoolmaster.

Limerick. Gross income, 1,864*l.* 4*s.* 10*d.* Expenditure, 263*l.* 14*s.*, among the choir-men and boys; 155*l.* 12*s.* 9½*d.* among curates, &c.; 582*l.* 10*s.* 11½*d.* for repairs, &c.; 582*l.* 7*s.* 1*d.* for collection, law expenses.

Cloyne. Gross income, 1,118*l.* 14*s.* 7½*d.* Expenditure, 1,006*l.* 17*s.* 4*d.* among vicar's choral; 199*l.* 10*s.* among reader, curates, and stipendiaries.

Tuam. Gross income, 197*l.* 0*s.* 7½*d.* Expenditure, 164*l.* to one vicar choral; 33*l.* 14*s.* to preacher, &c., and for collection.

Total gross income, 11,231*l.* 1*s.* 5½*d.* Total gross expenditure, 11,350*l.* 0*s.* 8½*d.*, the excess of gross expenditure over gross income is accounted for by referring to the observation annexed in the case of Armagh diocese.

ECONOMY ESTATES.

Armagh. Gross income, 171*l.* 6*s.* 2*d.* Expenditure, 175*l.* 16*s.* 7*d.*, repairs of fabric, and salaries of officers, servants, &c.: from what source the surplus expenditure over the receipts was supplied does not appear.

Down. Gross income, 276*l.* 18*s.* 5*d.* Expenditure, 276*l.* 18*s.* 5*d.*, repairs of cathedral, and payment of organist and choir.

Ossory. Gross income, 451*l.* 18*s.* 7*d.* Expenditure, 530*l.* 18*s.* 1*d.*, repairs of cathedral, and salaries of organists and servants: it does not appear how the surplus expenditure was provided for.

Leighlin. Gross income, 187*l.* 5*s.* 10*d.* Expenditure, 152*l.* 0*s.* 3*d.*, curates' salaries, and expense of repairs: the balance, 35*l.* 5*s.* 7*d.* uncollected.

Cashel. Gross income, 399*l.* 9*s.* Expenditure, 399*l.* 9*s.*, repairs of fabric, and maintenance of cathedral service.

Emly. Gross income, 94*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* Expenditure, 94*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.*, repair and maintenance of cathedral.

Waterford. Gross income, 138*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.* Expenditure, 133*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, payment of officers and repair of cathedral: 5*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* quit rent.

Lismore. Gross income, 823*l.*

10*s.* 8*d.* Expenditure, 823*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*, preachers, servants, and repair of cathedral.

Cork. Gross income, 786*l.* 3*s.* 6*d.* Expenditure, 851*l.* 11*s.* 4*d.*, salaries, repairs, and extra charges: it does not appear how the excess of expenditure was provided for.

Ross. Gross income, 550*l.* Expenditure, 194*l.* 16*s.* 3*d.*, salaries to officers and servants, and repairs: the economy estate has only amounted to 550*l.* of late years, by the expiration of the lease: 355*l.* 3*s.* 9*d.*, liquidation of debts.

Cloyne. 559*l.* 10*s.* 8*d.* Expenditure, 539*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*, officers' salaries, and repairs.

Killaloe. Gross income, 606*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.* Expenditure, 589*l.* 15*s.* 7*d.*, curates, officers, and servants' salaries, and repairs of cathedral.

Tuam. Gross income, 174*l.* 10*s.* 10*d.* Expenditure, 210*l.* 18*s.*, payment of organist's salary, servants, and officers, &c.; it does not appear how the surplus expenditure was provided for.

Elphin. Gross income, 46*l.* 3*s.* 1*d.* Expenditure, 46*l.* 3*s.* 1*d.*, repairs of cathedral, and diocesan school master's salary.

St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin Diocese. Gross income, 2,050*l.* 3*s.* 5*d.* Expenditure, 2,047*l.* 1*s.* 3½*d.*, repairs of fabric, liquidation of debts, and salaries of officers, servants, &c.

Total gross income, 7316*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.* Total expenditure, 7,426*l.* 9*s.* 3½*d.* The gross excess of expenditure over gross income is accounted for by the preceding observations.

SUMMARY OF ECCLESIASTICAL CORPORATIONS, &c.

Deans and Chapters. Gross income, 4,266*l.* 17*s.* 7*d.* Expenditure, 2,606*l.* 2*s.*—1,765*l.* 18*s.* 1*d.* net income divided among the members of three chapters.

Vicar's Choral Estates. Gross income, 11,261*l.* 1*s.* 5½*d.* Expenditure, 11,350*l.* 0*s.* 8½*d.*—744*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.*, in the net income divided among the canons, nine in number.

Minor canonries, &c. Gross income, 762*l.* 4*s.* 6½*d.* Expenditure, 17*l.* 15*s.* 4½*d.*

Ecclesiastical Estates. Gross income, 7,316*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.* Expenditure, 7,426*l.* 9*s.* 3*d.*

Total gross income, 23,606*l.* 4*s.*

11*d.* Total expenditure, 21,400*l.*

7*s.* 4*d.*

JOHN C. ERCE, Secretary.

The following is a General Bill of the Christenings and Burials within the city of London and Bills of Mortality, from Dec. 11, 1832, to Dec. 10, 1833:—

	Christened.	Buried
In the 97 parishes within the walls	636	1,336
In the 17 parishes without	4,560	4,753
In the 24 out-parishes in Middlesex and Surrey, including the district churches belonging to the same	17,740	16,172
In the 10 parishes in the City and Liberties of Westminster	3,950	4,316
Of the number buried were—		
Stillborn	-	684
Under 2 years of age	-	6,261
2 and under 3 years	-	2,605
3 .. 10 ..	-	1,145
10 .. 20 ..	-	970
20 .. 30 ..	-	1,700
30 .. 40 ..	-	2,225
40 .. 50 ..	-	2,615
50 .. 60 ..	-	2,412
60 .. 70 ..	-	2,551
70 .. 80 ..	-	2,045
80 .. 90 ..	-	802
90 .. 100 ..	-	107
100 ..	-	3
101 ..	-	1
102 ..	-	1
103 ..	-	1
104 ..	-	1
Decrease in the burials reported this year	-	2,029

POPEERY IN NEWFOUNDLAND.

(From the Protestant Journal.)

Perhaps in no colony belonging to Great Britain, are the Priests in connection with the Romish Church of a more low description than those who are in the employ of that Church in the island of Newfoundland. Papers up to the 12th of December last have reached us from that place, from which it may evi-

dently be gathered that the residence of Protestants in that island is likely shortly to become far from safe. The Roman Catholic population, who are the most numerous, are completely under the influence of a Priesthood more than commonly bigoted and mischievous. The Prelate who presides over the affairs of the Roman Catholic church in that island, is a person who has risen from an origin extremely low, and has surrounded himself, as might have been expected, by priests as ignorant and as bigoted as himself. Such is the abject humiliation to which the priesthood of that island, among whom a Reverend Father T. seems to be conspicuous, have reduced the people, that at a settlement ten miles from the capital of the island, a number of workmen and inhabitants who were employed about the erection of a new Chapel, have been actually seen to prostrate themselves, at this priest's direction, on the appearance in the chapel-yard of the Rt. Reverend Dr. Fleming. To this ignoramus of a Prelate, the title of LORD Bishop is constantly given by his clergy and his people. Public addresses, which seem to be paraded in the newspapers principally for the purpose of exhibiting his Holiness's LORDSHIP, are constantly framed by his clergy, and presented by the silly laity, with a nauseating recurrence of this assumed title. In cases of public election, none can dispute his Lordship's right to nomination of the candidate, who, spite of all who have a stake in the country, shall succeed. He and his half-a-dozen low mongrel priests declare from the altar that it is for the interests of religion that an avowed infidel—a professed disbeliever of Christianity,* and a declared bitter hater of the Church of

* The notorious Irish Agitator, in his second letter to the Protestants of Ireland, for the purpose of deluding them into combination with him and his minions, for a repeal of the Union, and to puff off the boasted charity of his Church, represents this pretty Legislator for Christians as a SCORCH PRESBYTERIAN! We have not represented him as above to serve a purpose, but cite from authentic and accredited information.

England, should be elected, and that although the opponent is a moderate Roman Catholic, all who vote for him may expect the grass to grow before their doors in a little time. This has, to the letter, been the actual fact as regards a late election to the local legislature of the island. The moderate Roman Catholic, much to his credit, yielded the ground, that he might not share with his demagogue priests the guilt of causing bloodshed; and the avowed infidel has been triumphantly returned into the house upon the shoulders of the Popish prelate and his unprincipled priests, one of whom, the Rev. EDWARD T—, * was actually seen mixing in the crowd during some lawless riots which followed this mock election of a representative, when the windows of the printing-offices which espoused the contrary side were unceremoniously smashed. From the letter of a Roman Catholic female, addressed to this beast of a man, it would appear that he is as devoid of all delicacy in his public ministrations as he is of principle in his political vagaries. That the Roman Catholic population can tolerate a man so outrageously indecent as he is ascribed to be, tells not well for the refinement of the members of their communion in Newfoundland, or for their fitness for the exercise of that political power which the grant to them of a local legislation and of a franchise almost universal, has placed in their hands, to the infinite horror, not only of the Protestant community, but of those Romanists also who have any thing to lose in that island. But now to the religion of the question. We copy the following from the paper just mentioned.

"We omit several articles this week, in order to give place to the following letter, in the sentiments of which we most fully and heartily concur with our *fair* correspondent. Her observations are not only pertinent, but are calculated to be useful in checking a course of conduct which reflects scandal and disgrace, not only upon the Catholic portion of the inhabitants, but upon the whole community in which we live.

To the Rev. Mr. T—, &c. &c.

"Reverend Sir—A feeling of diffidence has restrained me, week after week, from alluding to a line of conduct which has been adopted by yourself in the course of your public ministrations. Would that I were at liberty to show the reverence which I entertain for the constituted pastors of the Church, and my deep respect for her discipline, by still preserving silence! There are circumstances, however, at present existing, which compel me to break through the reserve of my sex.

"Reverend Sir, in your zeal to deter your flock from certain vices, you have forgotten the spirit of this observation of the Apostle. Through the indecent disclosures of the vices of your flock, which you have, from time to time, made from the altar, you have absolutely done very much to corrupt the imaginations of the lower classes of this community. You have contaminated the minds of the young; you have actually filled every rum-dealer's store, every house-kitchen, every child's nursery in this town, with disgusting details of low [debauchery, with which the members of your communion would not by any other means have become so generally acquainted. Through the ordinary channels of scandal,

* To exhibit somewhat of the origin as well as the principles of this man, we just adduce one evidence afforded us in the *Newfoundland Public Ledger* of Dec. 10th last, now before us. The Editor says—"We understand that the Rev. Father T., so called, in his public ministrations at the Catholic chapel on Sunday last, did himself the honour to compliment us in something like the following terms: 'And there is that *Orange* ragged wretch WINTON; there is no look will ever attend any thing that goes into his house or that comes out of it. But lit him go an—give him rope enough, and he'll hang himself.'"

these filthy, secret histories, and exposures of amours in low life, could never have acquired their present currency. Among scandal-mongers in general, there is a decent reverence for the ear of youth, a respect for the blush of maiden shame, a selection of the fit place, and a propriety of season for such idle talking. There is none such with you: you seem, in your honest zeal, to be superior to the consideration of the proprieties by which ordinary gossips are bound.

"Sunday after Sunday, Sir, it has been our fate—the eclaireissement of a single Sunday would not have called forth my pen—it has been our fate, one Sunday after another, to have dirty details of vulgar intrigue and debauchery forced upon our ears when we have been seeking to prepare chaste hearts and purified feelings for the sanctuary of the God of purity. Yes, Sunday after Sunday, a feeling of very painful suspense has been created in the bosom of every decent female of your communion, as to whether the known duty of Divine public worship should be neglected, or her innate feelings of delicacy wounded, through her exposing herself in the presence of many men besides her spiritual guides, to conversation to which, at no place but the altar, and at no lips but those of her priest, she would condescend to listen for a moment. The effect upon the less delicate of your communion is different; and through your observation of this effect it is, I suppose, that you have been led, unfortunately, to set remonstrance at nought, and to persevere in the indelicate course which you have adopted. They have been delighted to flock in increasing crowds to the school of scandal. It has furnished matter of exultation to the feelings of their depraved nature, to find that crimes in which they have indulged in secret, have been indulged also by

many who had hitherto preserved a decent name in society.

"In this letter, Reverend Sir, I do not appeal to your humanity: who would question it? I do not appeal to your feelings of Christian charity; it would be uncharitable to insinuate the need of such an appeal. I do not take the liberty of referring you to the merciful conduct of our Divine Redeemer towards the woman who was taken in the act of sin; I might subject myself to the charge of presumption, or might furnish you with fresh argument against the use of a volume which I highly prize.* I do not ask you whether, if a sorrowing sister should be deterred from a course of penitence and purity, and plunged, through your injudicious publication of her secret sinfulness, into a confirmed open course of shame, her soul's blood may not be required of the merciless man who shall have shut against her the door of return: you must be better informed on such points of casuistry than myself. But I do appeal to you by all your feelings of delicacy; for in the excess of your regard for purity, your conduct can alone have originated. I implore you by every feeling of decency and delicacy, and regard for the purity of the community in which you live, that you put a stop at once, Sir, and for ever, to such beastly profanations of your altar. Your reputation, I grieve to tell you, has suffered materially from this error in your judgment. You are suspected, Sir, of having within you a grossness of mind, mingled with a pride of office, and a severity of disposition, which ill becomes your order. By the disclosures which you have made from your altar, more injury, I can assure you, has been done to the morals of this community, than if your altar and your chapel walls had been decorated with the most voluptuous creations of *Titian*.

* Here is awful evidence of the prevailing and pertinacious principle of the Roman priesthood, every where the same, to suppress all appeal to the Scriptures, if they can.

"You have, by them, Sir, done more to deprave the minds of the young around you, than could fifty of the abandoned profligates whom you have held up to public notoriety by a relation of their names and of the particular delinquencies of which they have been guilty. Their examples before were secret; they are now set upon a hill. Pause, I entreat you, Sir, and consider whether at the tribunal of a God of purity, much future profligacy may not be charged upon yourself. The first notions of particular sins have been, I know, insinuated into the minds of hundreds of my sex by *you*! This has been the effect of your horrid and immodest disclosures. May God guard from present temptation, and from future profligacy, the tender, delicate youth of the Church, who would not at this moment, certainly, but for *you*—perhaps would *never*, but for *you*—have heard of those gross crimes which you have made familiar to the ears (oh! that I could think that, in many instances, they were not familiar also to their lips) as household words!

"I will trespass no longer, Rev. Sir, upon your very valuable time. I will only show you, by an extract which I have made from a favourite volume of devotions, that my own opinions are sanctioned by those of a very eminent divine. Your quotation of this admirable passage in a sermon, in the course of a few weeks, would show me that you accord with me, Reverend Sir, in the idea that the publication of Christian sentiments such as these from the pulpit of our chapel, is calculated to promote purity, much more than the particularizing of offences against purity, and the naming of the offences at the altar. Here is the extract, and I live in hope that I may yet hear it from your lips:—

"Scandalous it is to the faith we profess, that in a Christian country the like offences should ever occur. And much it is to be regretted, that

when they happen, they occupy both the thoughts and conversation of a neighbourhood. Remember, if such works of darkness are ever mentioned in your hearing, the less you say about them the better. The less pleasure you take in talking over the sins of others, the more likely you are to feel the weight of your own. Let, then, any such extreme case of transgression make you consider how many risks you run yourselves, and how deeply you need the grace of God to preserve your feet from falling. Let it move you to give the more earnest heed to sober advice. Let it make you more distasteful of those vanities which prepare the way to ruin, and more distrustful of that ability of your own which is, at the very best, but weakness. Let it remind you to watch and pray, lest you enter into temptation; to watch and pray against whatever sin doth most easily beset you. And let it incline you to intercede for others also, even for those most flagrant offenders, in the charitable hope that it will please God not only to strengthen such as do stand, and to comfort and help the weak-hearted, but to raise up them that fall, and finally to beat down Satan under their feet.'

"I am, Reverend Sir,
 "Yours, with deep respect,
 "A FEMALE CATHOLIC."

THE CHURCH IN RUSSIA.—Of the Established or Orthodox Greek Church, the members may be said to amount to 81,782,000. The Emperor is the head! With respect to the constitution and independence, it has no connexion with the four Patriarchs of the Oriental Church. The will of the monarch is the highest point of appeal, but the business of the Church is under the management of the Holy Synod, in connexion with the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs. To this supreme legislative court, the consistories and clergy, both superior and inferior, are subject.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
AND
Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXX.

APRIL, 1834.

VOL. III.

BLESSED ARE THE MEEK—A SERMON.

“Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.”—*Matt. v. 5.*

That the meek, the mild, and the gentle, should be in a peculiar sense the care of heaven, is a truth which, even if it had not been revealed, all men would be ready to admit. It might, however, be natural to suppose that persons of this class must even more than others look for their reward in softer regions, and in climes more congenial than the present world. It might be thought that for brisker spirits and more resisting tempers, the good things of this life were more attainable—that amidst the oppositions of interest and the collisions of effort—that in that race of rivalry which so many are running, and where the prizes are so few, the gentle must be thrust aside, and the meek-spirited decline the contest; and so it would be in a great measure, if happiness consisted in objects of outward splendour and vain ambition. But, in the words before us, we are taught a far different lesson; we are told that the meek are happy; and that to such a temper and disposition of the soul belongs, in a peculiar manner, not merely happiness in reversion, but happiness in present possession—in a word, the utmost enjoyment allotted to man while here below. “Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.” Let us then devote the opportunity now afforded us, to a few reflections on so calm and delightful a subject.

In the first place, meekness tends to promote the comfort and enjoyment of our condition, by disposing us to live peaceably with those around us, and thereby inclining them to live peaceably with us. There are, no doubt, some spirits so contrary, as the apostle speaks, to all men, so indisposed to fair adjustment and candid explanation, that it is hard for the utmost gentleness

to allay such ruffled waters; and though there is a wisdom in meekness, which discerns the obvious duty of withdrawing ourselves when we can from such society, yet nevertheless Providence not unfrequently forbids the extrication; and God, at times, constrains his children to dwell with Mesech, and to have their habitation among the tents of Kedar, even to take their lot with them that are enemies unto peace. In these most trying circumstances, however, the Christian can at least possess his soul in patience. A soft answer turneth away wrath, for where the fire is nourished by no fuel, it soon goes out. In failure of all secondary means, God himself arises to help the meek upon earth; and where the ways of a man please the Lord, he maketh even his enemies to be at peace with him. But the truth is, such unreasonable spirits are not frequently to be met with. In many of the disputes that arise, both parties are to blame, not always in the same degree, but still something is contributed on either side to foment the quarrel. But in proportion as we are truly meek, no provocation will arise on our part. There will be no conflicting of pride with pride; that uneasy passion cannot endure a rival; the proud man must have the whole field to himself; and when his restless movements come in contact with a mind as unyielding and unbending as his own, thence arise those deadly hates and those interminable contests which fill the earth with violence. But it is well known that those who are proud themselves, love and admire humility in others. Upon the soft green of meekness, the sleepless eye of fevered passion will sometimes delight to dwell. To turn aside from the face of defiance, of rivalry, and hostility, and look upon that countenance which speaks peace and good will to all, will give at least a momentary calm to bosoms which too often heave with the swellings of disappointment and of wounded passion. It is thus that the meek dwell in quiet habitations, and in a peaceful atmosphere of their own creating. The proud, the high spirited, the men that will bend to no one else, will often bend to them. They will be gentle to the gentle, and change their nature when brought into contact with the meek. They will lay aside their arms with those in whose hands they see no weapons of defiance. They will delight in honouring those men whom they see inclined to take the lowest room. They will often wonder at the excellent spirit that dwells within them. They will contrast the storms which blow upon the summits to which the proud aspire, with the serenity of those souls which dwell in the peaceful vales of humility and meekness. They will testify to the superior condition of the meek, with a conviction scarce less piercing to the soul than that of the rich man who, being in hell, lifted up his eyes and saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. Nay, from admiring, they will in some happy instances proceed to imitating; they will (if it be right so to accommodate these words) learn of those who ~~are~~ meek and lowly in heart, and find rest unto their souls. And is not this, my brethren, to inherit the earth? Is it

not a state at least of comparative blessedness to live at peace even with the unkind and froward? Nay, by the meekness of our conversation to assuage the tumults of the troubled soul, and to bring those that labour and are heavy laden to take upon them that yoke which is easy and that burden which is light? Such are the blessed privileges of the children of God. Let all, then, who hear me, and who hope, through the faith of the Gospel and the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, that they are his adopted sons, look well that in this respect they walk as their Saviour also walked; that they behave towards all men with invariable gentleness and meekness; that they return not evil for evil, nor railing for railing, but contrariwise, blessing; that when they are reviled, they revile not again; in a word, that they spread around them a field of happy contemplation, in tranquillising the souls which live within their influence, and bringing back those who wander without rest to that peace of God which passeth all understanding.

Meekness promotes our present comfort, by teaching us to forgive injuries. There are provocations, unkindnesses, and affronts, which it is impossible for us to avoid feeling; but it is one thing to feel them when they first assail us, and another thing to brood over them and to let them fester in the heart. The misery of this latter is best known by experience. Those whose bosoms have rankled with resentment, find it often sharper than a serpent's tooth. It robs life of all its sweetness; no subjects can interest; no assiduities can please; no varieties or change of scene can break the spell by which the mind is bound. It is bent on cherishing its own discomfort, and rejects every offered blessing, because it interrupts the fixed monotony of that pain which preys upon the vitals. In this state the day is, as it were, a waking dream, and the night can bring no slumber to the eyelids, no rest unto the soul. Out of this distress there is one deliverance, and that is to forgive the injury. But when the tempers are unmortified, this healing medicine is not at hand to cure. The wounded spirit may sometimes wish to forgive, but stubborn nature cannot yield; the recollected insult opens all its wounds afresh. We may try to bear ingratitude, but the burden of it is intolerable. None but the meek-spirited can, when put keenly to the trial, freely and from the heart forgive. And truly it may be said that there is a pleasure in forgiveness, which those alone that forgive can know. Out of the soft and yielding substance of a meek soul, the sharpest arrow can be at once extracted; the wound is healed as soon as felt. Out of the dark waters of resentment the meek at once emerge; no deep plottings of revenge, no disappointed schemes of retaliation can detain them there; for they can love their enemies; they can call to mind their own transgressions, and hasten to forgive others, as God, for Christ's sake, has forgiven them. Injuries cannot rob them of their sleep by night, nor cloud the sunshine of their breast by

day. God hides them in his sacred pavilion from the provoking of all men, and from the strife of tongues.

Meekness is the rest and serenity of the soul; and it may be affirmed, however we account for it, that whenever the mind is free from disturbances and excitements from without, when it subsides into itself, and into the stillness of calm thought, it is happy. The wicked cannot think; they cannot descend from the surface into the deep waters of the soul; because it is there that conscience dwells.

In the silence of the inward man, the still small voice of God's Vicegerent can be distinctly heard, and therefore the guilty fly from their own interior, and seek a refuge from themselves in that animal nature which the union with the body throws around them. But where the intentions are sincere, where the conscience speaks an approving sentence, where the soul reposes in the blood of Jesus, and, justified by faith, is at peace with God; there the stillness of the mind, and the pure and unimpeded exercise of thought, is a pleasure so satisfying and so refined that it seems at times like some balmy breeze from heaven, or like the breath of God himself. These are the days in God's Courts, one of which, the Psalmist says, is better than a thousand. These are the hours when the heirs of immortality remember God upon their beds. These are the seasons when the pure in heart see God, and when the man of prayer holds converse with his Father who seeth in secret, and soars upon the wings of confidence and love into the regions of light, and into the realms of glory.

But it is not merely from the natural operation of meekness that these blessings are derived. The meek are, in a peculiar manner, the care of heaven, as abundant Scriptures testify. They are led into the paths of wisdom and of truth, by the hand of God himself. "Them that are meek," says the Psalmist, "shall he guide in judgment, and such as are gentle, them shall he learn his way." "For God resists the proud," saith St. James, "and giveth grace unto the humble." The meek are invited to cast all their temporal cares upon God, "For in the times of dearth they shall have enough: the meek shall eat and be satisfied." "The Lord lifteth up the meek, while he casteth the wicked down to the ground." "The Lord taketh pleasure in his people: he will beautify the meek with salvation." "The meek, also, shall encrease their joy in the Lord, and the poor among men shall rejoice in the Holy One of Israel." "The meek spirited shall possess the earth, and shall be refreshed in the multitude of peace." "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy, I dwell in the high and holy place; with him, also, that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." These passages need no comment: they all concentrate in one point of clear and lumi-

mons proof, that humility is that favoured soil on which the richest dews of heaven descend; that "blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth."

But this promise has, doubtless, a farther bearing. That meekness which flows from faith in Christ claims an inheritance in the new heavens and the new earth. All that the meek can taste of here is but an earnest of their future joys. Their pleasures here are mingled and disturbed; many are the troubles of the righteous: the feeling heart and gentle spirit often mourn for that peace which no efforts can conciliate, and breathe their sighs to heaven in solitary places. But the mind which seeks for peace on earth shall find it without alloy in heaven. The soul which catches every partial gleam and passing gale of spiritual happiness here below, shall rise to pure felicity in freer air and under cloudless skies. Its heaven is begun on earth, and it contains within it that imperishable principle, which, by its own native tendency shall ascend to the light and glory of the presence of God.—That

—— Land of pure delight
Where pains immortal reign;
Where infinite day excludes the night,
And pleasures banish pain.

Into those regions the meek shall, through the blood of that spotless Lamb who was meek and lowly in heart, infallibly find a passage. When the reign of discord and turbulence is over; the gates of heaven will open; its everlasting doors will be lifted up, and those who have been conformed in life to the humility of the Son of God, shall enter in. There they shall rest from all their troubles by fountains of still water, and repose upon green pastures, beneath those trees which lift their branches in the paradise of God. Or sometimes, (tasting of these varieties in which Scripture paints the happiness above,) they will leave these pastoral scenes of bliss, and enter into the glories of the New Jerusalem. There it will delight them to tell its towers, and mark well its bulwarks, and to gaze upon its glittering pinnacles and spires, gilded by the uncreated light of God: to visit there the abodes of angels, and the habitations of just men made perfect: to enter into those tribunals of solemn justice, whose sanctions are resistless power, and whose decrees are everlasting righteousness; or to worship in that temple not made with hands; for in the heavenly Jerusalem the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. These are the mansions in which those that humble themselves shall be exalted: these are the celestial habitations in the new heavens and the new earth, which God has prepared for the meek.

But will it by some be thought presumptuous that any should feel an assured and joyful hope that this high inheritance is theirs? It would, indeed, be presumptuous, daring, insolent and vain, if the child of corruption and of dust claimed it as the

reward of his own merits, or in his own strength assayed to scale the steep ascent to heaven. But meekness has no deservings of its own to plead. It is its nature and property, to know that man is, of himself, utterly reprobate and vile; that to him belongs only shame and confusion of face; that were he to meet the awful purity of God's justice, his only hope, though vain it were, would be, that the mountains should fall on him, and that the hills should cover him. But is it presumptuous to trust, not in ourselves, but in the living God? Is it arrogant to give obedient and implicit credence to what the mouth of the Lord hath spoken? If the Almighty has sent down his message of glad tidings, is it pride or vanity in his servants to hear? Is it, in a word, the high-minded who feel convinced of sin—who bring themselves in guilty before God—who fly for refuge to the atonement offered upon the cross—whose only ground of hope is in Him who came to seek and to save that which was lost, and to die, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God? No, my brethren; the foundation of the sinner's hope is laid, not in his pride, but in his humility and meekness. But beside all this, on what principle can even the man of the world feel jealous of those who meekly and patiently look for happiness in heaven? Surely, according to the general estimate of the world, if in this life only the meek had hope, they were of all men most miserable. The meek are not their competitors for the high things of life; they rival no man's claims for them; they covet no man's possessions; they desire to give to all their dues, and to owe no man any thing, but to love one another. And shall these be thought aspiring if they seek invisible treasures, of which they would wish all to be partakers? Whom do they interfere with, or defraud, if they expect a share in blessings, free to others as the light of heaven, and boundless as eternity? What selfish or exclusive interests do they pursue when their prayer is, that all should repent themselves and turn to God, and that heaven may spread wide her tents, and enlarge her curtains to the utmost boundaries of space, and throw open all her gates to receive multitudes countless as the stars, and as the sand upon the sea shore innumerable?

H. W.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

In presenting to the readers of the **CHRISTIAN EXAMINER** a contraction of a series of Papers on Theological Education in Germany, which appeared three years ago in a very ably conducted and orthodox American periodical entitled the "**Biblical Repository**," edited by Professor Robinson of Andover College; we hope we may not be considered as departing too much from our character for originality. We are not aware that American religious publications have, as yet, an extended circulation in Ireland, and therefore consider it as highly probable that these papers have not been seen by many of our subscribers. They are written by Professor Robinson himself, after a personal inspection of the state of Germany; and we are glad to catch at an opportunity of giving additional circulation to information conveyed through such able and trustworthy hands:—

"The history of Germany for several centuries is an object of intense interest to the theologian, as well as to the politician. That assemblage of nations comprised under the general name of Germany, has long been what it still is, a people of comparatively little practical energy, but of vast intellectual exertion. Broken up into a multitude of larger or of petty states, without a capital to serve as a centre of laws or of religious effort; and living under governments essentially despotic, their moral and mental energies have had no outlet in the ordinary channels of civil life and practical utility which exist under free governments, and have therefore been able to display themselves only in the walks of literature and theoretical science. But in all that regards intellectual labour and intellectual excitement, and in all that serves as sustenance to these, the Germans fall at least behind no other people; in many things they have been far in advance of all other nations. The art of printing, with all its mighty results, owes its birth to Germany. Here, too, was engendered that spark, which kindled and spread with the rapidity of lightning over Northern Europe, and produced at length the clear and steady light of the Reformation—the great principle of liberty of thought, suggested to the mind of the Monk of Wittenberg, and by him spread out before the world—and in England coupled with the great kindred principle of liberty of action—that has lain at the foundation of all the mighty movements of succeeding centuries. If it were right to refer to a single individual that which was but the expression of the spirit of an age, we might thus ascribe to Luther not only the Reformation in Germany and England, but also regard his exertions as the germ from which have sprung all the great political events that have since astonished and convulsed the world; the revolutions of England and of France; and with happier results, the foundation of a new empire in a new hemisphere; with the revolution by which this last threw off the

pressure of a foreign yoke, and founded, on a basis unknown in history, institutions of freedom which will bear the test of experience, so long as virtue and intelligence shall be the characteristics of the people; but which, it requires not the power of prophetic vision to foresee, will be surely swept away, whenever ignorance and irreligion shall become predominant in the land.

"The light of the Reformation has not yet departed from Germany; although its glory has been obscured in these latter days, by urging to an extreme the fundamental principles on which it proceeded. The Reformers, with all their zeal for liberty of thinking and freedom of investigation, never had a thought of subjecting the form and matter of revelation to the decisions of human reason. With them the Bible was THE ONLY AND SUFFICIENT RULE OF FAITH AND PRACTICE. Their reason acknowledged its authority as paramount to all other, and yielded with reverent submission to the guidance of its holy precepts. In modern times, men whose hearts have been opposed to the truths of revelation, have carried their freedom of investigation to the extreme of calling in question and denying, not only the fact of an actual revelation, but also the possibility of one at any time and in any circumstances. The reason of man has been proclaimed the source and the interpreter of all religion; the Scriptures declared to be the production of merely human wisdom; and all systems of faith and practice deduced from their pages denounced as the imposition of a crafty priesthood upon the ignorant and credulous. All this, however, is nothing more than had already taken place, and with still greater virulence, in other nations; especially in England and France. The difference is, that in the latter countries these enemies of revelation were not enrolled under the banners of the church; they attacked her as open adversaries; while in Germany the poison has spread through the body of the church itself; and those who have solemnly bound themselves to make the Bible their only rule of faith and practice, have been among the first to discard its authority and contest its doctrines. The rationalism of Germany is the deism of England. The latter was professed by a few; the former has spread among the many; and its advocates, by pressing their consistency to its ultimate results, have already produced a reaction, which promises, by the blessing of God, in time to bring back the German churches to the faith and practice of the Gospel, as exhibited in the principles of the Reformation.

"In Germany a love of antiquity predominates in external things, although discarded in regard to intellectual matters; and centuries seem there to be less remote from one another than we have here been accustomed to conceive them. The period of the Reformation seems hardly separated from the present time. The names of Luther and Melancthon are as familiar in the mouths of the people, as with us those of Washington and

Franklin; and the great Reformer is regarded with the same sort of filial veneration as is our great champion of civil liberty. You pass through the small city of Eisleben, and visit his father's house. An inscription above the door announces that this was the birth-place of Luther. A school for poor children is now kept in the house, the master of which shews you around, and explains to you the relics they have collected in the room where the Reformer was born. At Wittenberg you visit his cell in the old convent, now the location of a theological seminary; you see there the table, the huge stove, the seat in the window, just as when occupied by Luther in the beginning of his career; and it requires no great stretch of imagination to behold him and Melancthon engaged in discussions which they little expected were to agitate the world. You enter the ancient church by the door on which Luther posted up his celebrated theses; within, the two friends lie entombed over against each other, in front of the pulpit, and their portraits hang upon the walls. You go to the spot where Luther publicly burned the Pope's bull, and thus cut off all hope of reconciliation; you walk the streets of the city, and all now remains as it was then. The persons and the generation are gone, but their place, and their houses, and their streets, and all the objects by which they were surrounded, are still before you, and are now presented to your eyes, just as once they met their view.

"The Germans, in their love of antiquity, are also eminently lovers of history. They require for every opinion and every doctrine, not only the proofs of reason and Scripture, but also the historical proof. They thus make history what it really is, the record of the experience of past ages; and they are slow to give credit to that which has not been tested by this experience. In this way the history of the Church has become to them one of the prime elements of the study of theology; and without this, one would no more be accounted an accomplished theologian, than he would be without a knowledge of the original languages of the Bible. One part of this history, viz. *Dogmengeschichte*, the history of doctrinal theology, or of the rise and development of the doctrines which are, and have been current within the pale of the church, is almost peculiar to Germany. It cannot be denied that this is a department of very great importance; or that a doctrine or system of doctrines will ordinarily be better understood, if we know the occasion of their rise, the circumstances and character of those by whom they were first advanced, the discussions and contests they have undergone, the various modifications they may have received—in short, all the historical facts and events connected with them, through the influence of which they have assumed the shape in which they are now presented to us. This subject has usually been treated of in Germany as a branch of ecclesiastical history in general; though several works of merit have appeared, devoted to the separate and more detailed consideration of it.

"As a suitable transition to the more immediate object of the present article, it may be observed that the universities of Germany are also intimately connected with the history and antiquities of the country. Of those which still exist, the following were founded before the Reformation, viz. Prague in 1348, Vienna 1365, Heidelberg 1386, Leipsic 1409, Rostock 1419, Griefswalde 1456, Freiburg 1457, Tübingen 1447, Wittemberg 1502. This last, which in the first twenty years of its existence became, to its immortal honor, the cradle of the Reformation, was in 1815 transferred to Halle and united with the younger university of that place. This was done by the Prussian government on very sufficient grounds, after the union of that part of Saxony with Prussia: but it was done greatly against the wishes and the will of the people at large, to whom that spot had become consecrated in history. To quiet the people of Wittemberg, a theological seminary was established there in place of the university, in which young men who have finished their university course, may still pursue their studies. There is here free provision for twenty-two pupils; and the number of those who support themselves is not limited. Two of the old Professors of the university, Schleusner and Nitzsch, were left here to sleep out the remainder of their lives; while the general superintendence and instruction is entrusted to Heubner, a learned and pious man. The seminary, however, is little frequented.—In all the universities above-mentioned, the rights and privileges, the organization, the modes of teaching, indeed the whole external character of the institutions, have come down from a period anterior to the Reformation, except so far as they were necessarily modified by the changes which then took place. Throughout Protestant Germany, the system of university education is, in its leading features, one and the same. It is the result of the experience of several centuries, and is now so interwoven with the character and principles, with the affections and prejudices of the people, that a change would be in a measure impossible.

GERMAN UNIVERSITIES.

"A German university is essentially a *professional* school, or rather an assemblage of such schools, comprising the four faculties of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy; the latter of which corresponds to what is elsewhere called the faculty of letters and science, and embraces every thing not strictly comprehended in some one of the other three. Those students who attend lectures in the first three faculties, do it merely as a course of professional study, and with direct reference to the professional occupations of their future lives. Those who attend in the philosophical faculty, are mostly such as are preparing themselves to become professors in the universities, or teachers in the classical or other schools; or they are qualifying

themselves for the general pursuits of literature and science; or they are such as are chiefly attending to professional studies in one of the first three faculties, but wish, at the same time, to make themselves acquainted with other branches of learning.

"The universities of Germany were all founded by the governments of the countries in which they are respectively situated; but up to the time of the Reformation all such foundations, with their rights and privileges, had to receive the confirmation of the Popes. That of Wittemberg in 1502 was the first that was confirmed by the Emperor of Germany, and not by the Pope; although the assent of the latter was afterwards applied for. That of Marburg in 1525 was at first confirmed by neither Pope nor Emperor, but received afterwards the sanction of the latter. After the Reformation, all new universities were confirmed by the Emperors in the rights and privileges granted to them by their own Sovereigns. The last which received this sanction was that of Göttingen in 1734. Erlangen, founded in 1743, appears not to have received it. From that time till the dissolution of the German Empire in 1806, no new university was established. Those which have been since founded, as Berlin, Bonn, and Munich, exist, of course, only by the will of their own Sovereigns, than which there is at present no higher authority.

"At the present day, all the universities are immediately and entirely dependent on the respective governments within whose bounds they fall. All the professors and instructors of every kind are appointed, and, generally speaking, their salaries paid, directly by the government; which supports also or directs the whole expense of the university, of the erection and repair of buildings, of the increase of the library and scientific collections, &c. The writer has not sufficient information to enable him to state with precision what sums are annually appropriated to the support of the universities, nor even of the several larger ones. He only knows that the Prussian government pays annually, on account of each of the Universities of Halle and Bonn, the sum of 80,000 rix dollars.* The government of Würtemberg appropriates annually to the university of Tübingen the sum of 80,000 florins.† This is exclusive of the expense of a particular institution in the university (to be described hereafter,) for the support of Protestant and Catholic theological students; the annual cost of which is from 90,000 to 100,000 florins. The universities do not exist as independent associations, under charters granted by the governments, but stand immediately under their control, are regulated by them, and may at any moment be abolished by a decree of the same power which called them into existence.

"The professors are of two kinds, ordinary and extraordinary. They are all appointed alike, but differ in rank. The ordinary professors, strictly speaking, constitute the faculty; they are

* A rix-dollar is about four shillings.

† A florin is about two shillings.

members of the academical senate, and thus have a voice in the government of the university; they have a dean of the faculty, who is always chosen by and from themselves. When appointed, the ordinary professors may enter immediately on their duties without inauguration; but in order to enjoy all the rights and immunities of their office, and especially to be eligible as dean of the faculty, they must first hold a public disputation in Latin *pro loco obtinendo*. The professors extraordinary are simply teachers, and have no further duties nor privileges. Besides these there is another class of private instructors, *privatim docentes*, composed of young men who have taken the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, (equivalent to our Master of Arts,) and have then permission to read lectures and give private instruction in the universities.—The regular salaries of the ordinary professors vary according to circumstances from 500 to 2000 rix dollars, and rarely exceed the latter sum. The professors extraordinary seldom receive more than 500 rix dollars; often not more than 100; and the instances are not rare, where a man is at first glad to receive merely the title, without any salary whatever. The private teachers also have no salary. All the professors and instructors receive fees from the students for their private courses of lectures; which, however, except in extraordinary cases, do not amount to any considerable sum.

“This class of private teachers is the nursery in which all future professors are trained; where they are ~~men~~ just budding into life; and whence, if they flourish with a vigorous and healthy growth, they are soon transplanted to a maturer soil. If a young man distinguishes himself in this situation, he is very soon promoted to be a professor extraordinary. The governments have here an opportunity to judge of the qualifications of candidates for literary stations; and of selecting and securing the services of the best men; and to a young man of real promise, they are usually not slow in holding out a reward. A young man of talent and promise came to Halle in 1827 as a private instructor in the department of history; in 1828 he was made professor extraordinary, and in 1829 advanced to the rank of ordinary professor; and such instances are not uncommon. The extraordinary professorship, again, is regarded as a stepping stone to the ordinary one. It gives a young man a certain rank and standing in the university; he no longer reads lectures merely on sufferance; he has at least a permanent place; has enjoyed the notice of government; and is sure, if he continues to distinguish himself, of being further promoted. This however does not always take place of course. It is not unfrequent that a young man starts well in the beginning, who afterwards sits down satisfied with his present attainments, and makes no further progress. In such a case, his promotion is at an end, so far as the merits of the individual are concerned; for here, as elsewhere, importunity and favouritism often produce results, at which the public, who judge the question on its merits, are

astonished. At Halle were two extraordinary professors of theology of about seventy years of age, who had held that station during the greater part of their lives; in 1829 one of them was made *ordinarius*, while the other remains as before. Private teachers are also sometimes found of the age of forty or fifty years; but they are usually such as have not had interest enough with the government to rise in spite of mediocrity.—In some instances literary men, with the permission of the government, give courses of lectures at the universities, and receive fees, without being attached to the institution in any other way than as *privatim docentes*. Thus the historian Niebuhr, in his character of Member of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, reads lectures at Bonn; and at Halle a former Major-general was lecturing on military history and tactics.

“The lectures delivered by the instructors are of three kinds, and are given *publice, privatim, et privattissime*. The first or public lectures are given only by professors, and constitute nominally that course of instruction for which they receive salaries from government. Originally this was actually the case, and all regular instruction at the universities was free; as it still is in the *Collège de France* and other public schools of Paris. In process of time, however, it was found more profitable to give private courses, for which a small fee was charged; and it has now come to the point, that no professor reads more than one public course, and that usually consisting of only one lecture in each week. The object is, to give as little free instruction as will comport with the tenor of their appointments. The second class, or private lectures, are those which have thus been introduced. They are precisely similar in their nature to the public ones, and delivered in the same place, and often to the same hearers. The only difference is that for these, each student pays a small fee; and the professor consequently endeavours to make these courses more interesting and instructive. The courses continue nominally six months; the year being divided into two terms or semesters, with a vacation of five or six weeks in the spring and autumn. Most of the professors give two courses of private lectures in each term, and sometimes three; in some of the courses lectures are delivered six times a week; in others four; and sometimes, though rarely, only twice. The fees paid by the students are small; for a course of theological lectures never more than one *Frédéric d'or*, or about four dollars. In some instances a professor of law receives double fees; and even much more than this is paid for some courses of medical lectures. In the larger universities, as Berlin and Göttingen, where things are done more genteelly, these payments must always be made in gold. In Halle they may be made in any species of money; and the price of a course is graduated according to the number of lectures in a week. The private teachers receive the same fees as the professors; and for the sake of popularity usually give also a course of public lectures, although this is not

a necessary part of their duties.—The instruction which is given *privatissime*, consists simply in private lessons.

“The number of hearers whom a lecturer can draw together, depends upon the nature of his subject and his reputation. It depends also upon the general number of the students who frequent that particular university; although this again is in some degree dependent upon the celebrity of the professor, or rather the professors. If these have a high reputation, the university will generally not want for students. Sometimes also an individual professor makes an important improvement in some branch of science or literature, and creates a new era in regard to it. In such cases a new impulse is given to that particular study; students are attracted to his university; and his lecture room is crowded. Gesenius may be quoted as an instance of this, in respect to Hebrew literature. In the winter of 1829-30 the writer attended his course on Genesis, which he reads every two years. At the opening of the course he took occasion to remark, that he was then about to read it for the tenth time; and adverted to the very great progress made in this branch of study, and the very great interest taken in it now, compared with twenty years ago. At that time he commenced the same course with fourteen hearers; he was now addressing five hundred. He added, that he had then felt quite satisfied even with that comparatively small number; inasmuch as a previous course on the same book, by Professor Vater, had been attended by only three. The great influx of theological students to Halle had thus been occasioned by the influence of his name. In like manner, the reputation of a particular faculty often draws to a university a larger number of students in that department. Thus the faculty of law at Göttingen has enjoyed a high reputation, and has attracted young men from every part of Germany. At present all the faculties in the University of Berlin are filled with some of the most distinguished men of Germany; and the consequence is a larger concourse of students than has ever been known at any other Protestant institution. The lecture room of Gesenius is probably better filled than any other in Germany. Neander, in Berlin, had usually from three to four hundred in his exegetical course on the New Testament; in his other courses fewer. The younger Eichhorn, the jurist, in Göttingen, had about three hundred, and was considered the most popular lecturer on law in the country. He has since retired. His father, the Orientalist, had ordinarily from ninety to a hundred hearers. Wegschieder and Thilo of Halle have each about three hundred. These are some of the more popular lecturers; with others the number varies according to circumstances, and is not unfrequently less than ten.

As a general fact, the professors deliver their lectures at their own houses. The recent universities of Berlin and Bonn occupy former palaces, and have ample room for all necessary lecture rooms, as well as for public collections. In Halle also the uni-

versity has one large lecture room, which is occupied by the theological professors in succession. But in Göttingen, and at most of the other universities, each professor has to provide his own *auditorium*, and the accommodations for sitting and writing are commonly of the rudest kind. It is not unusual for the students to have to hurry from one lecture to another, at the distance perhaps of half a mile. To accommodate them in this respect, the professor does not commence until five or ten minutes, as the case may be, after the hour has struck. In Berlin, although this reason does not exist, the lectures uniformly do not commence until a quarter after the hour, and are broken off punctually at the striking of the clock. They thus actually occupy only three quarters of an hour; although a full hour is the legitimate and usual time.

The students, before entering the university, are required to have passed through a regular course of preparatory study at the *gymnasien*, or public classical schools. At these schools, boys are taken at the age of from eight to twelve; and are trained in a thorough course of classical study. They are taught, not only to read the Greek and Latin with fluency, but also to write them. They are moreover accustomed to speak the latter language with ease, and in the latter part of their course to hold all their exercises in it. This is one of the great secrets of the advantage of classical study as the foundation of a liberal education.

The students, on entering the university from the *gymnasien*, pass from a state of discipline and close supervision to a state of entire freedom. Having once chosen their professions, they may attend what lectures they please, and as few as they please; they may live where they please, and do what they please. The university exercises no authority over them whatever, so long as they are not guilty of open misconduct. These are circumstances which may serve to account for that wild spirit of insubordination and visionary liberty which has been represented as so prevalent among the students of Germany. Prevalent it undoubtedly has been and is still; but probably in a much less degree than has generally been supposed. The riots, and duels, and *renouming*, all the noise, and folly, and crime, are confined to a few in comparison with the great body of the students, who are engaged in a course of silent, persevering study. The noise and bustle of these few have struck foreigners as a peculiar feature of the German students, and have therefore been fully and frequently described, while the more noiseless course of the many has escaped their observation. The circumstances above mentioned have operated more conspicuously in the smaller university cities, such as Jena, Göttingen, &c., where the students, feeling their importance in respect to the inhabitants, have assumed a greater license, and have been at the same time unrestrained by the force of public opinion. The modern plan of locating universities in large cities has been eminently successful in abolishing this spirit. The students in Berlin, for instance, are lost in the crowd of

population, and could not as a body indulge in any of the freaks which are common at other universities, without being borne down by the ridicule of the surrounding multitudes.

The students, as has been already said, attend what courses of lectures they please. There are, however, certain professional courses which they must have attended, in order to be afterwards admitted to an examination. In theology, for instance, a man must have heard lectures in all the four departments of exegesis, *Dogmatik*, or doctrinal theology, ecclesiastical history, and *Homiletik*, or practical theology. These are significantly called *Brodcollegia*; because a man's future bread depends on his having heard them. In Berlin there is also a regulation that the students in theology shall attend the courses in a certain order, inasmuch as it was found that they often attended the practical lectures before they were acquainted with either exegetical or systematic theology. Very often, too, the students in general attend the lectures of a particular professor from fashion rather than from any choice. Not unfrequently there are lecturers in the philosophical department, who draw crowded audiences out of all the other faculties. This is the case with Ritter, of Berlin, the celebrated geographer, a man of piety and genuine simplicity of character, as well as of profound learning in his department. The lectures of Böckh on Greek antiquities are also attended by all classes of hearers. In like manner it is fashionable to attend the courses of Blumenbach at Göttingen. The fashion, however, often varies from year to year, and in regard to the different courses of the same professors.

As a general rule, all the students not only take notes of the lectures, but mostly write them out in full. The professor often spends a part of the time in regular dictation, which is written down by all; while between the paragraphs he gives extempore illustrations, which are also seized and written down by many. It is exceedingly rare to see a student in the lecture room without his writing materials in busy use. These are very simple, consisting of a small portfolio, or *Mappe*, in which he carries his pens and paper, and a small turned inkstand of horn, with a cover that screws on, and a small sharp spike on the bottom, by which it is stuck fast upon the bench or writing-table before him. They are exceedingly punctual: and the few minutes previous to the entrance of the professor are usually devoted to mending their pens and putting their papers in order; this is accompanied by a general whistling and buz of conversation. The moment the professor enters, all is hushed; he begins immediately to read, and they to write, sometimes without interruption till the striking of the clock. In this way they hurry from one lecture to another, and it is not uncommon for them to attend five or six every day. There are not wanting instances where a student has in this manner been present at ten different courses; but this is quite rare. They very generally review at home the lectures thus written down; and read or consult the books referred to by the

professor. This is sometimes done in companies of five or six; who by their mutual remarks serve to imprint the subjects more deeply on the minds of each other. They thus obtain, generally speaking, a clear view and receive a deep impression of so much information as the professor has chosen to give them. There are others, although their number is comparatively small, who merely make the lectures what they are in fact, a clue for the guidance of their studies, and go into extensive and profound investigation for themselves. These are the men who love knowledge for its own sake, as well as because it is power; and while the multitude are ready to take up with the reports of others, they wish to trace for themselves the stream of knowledge to its source, and drink of its pure waters at the crystal fountain.

"The regular time necessary to be spent at the German universities in professional studies, is for medical students four years; for all others three years. As a general rule, young men are required to be principally educated at the universities of their own state; but are allowed to spend one year of their course at any foreign university. Thus natives of Prussia who study theology must remain at least two years at some Prussian university; in the other year they may go wherever they please. Those states which have no university of their own, usually adopt a neighbouring one. Thus Göttingen, which belongs to Hanover, is at the same time adopted by Brunswick and Nassau as their university; and the young theologians of these states are obliged to spend at least two years on the classic, though somewhat naked banks of the Leine.

"After these remarks on the general character of the German universities, it may not be uninteresting to the reader to give an alphabetical list of them, accompanied by notices of their general history; of the more distinguished professors, especially in the Theological Faculties; of the number and general division of the students, so far as known; of their libraries, &c.

I. BERLIN. Population, 220,000. University supported by the influence of the Court and Government; is established in an immense palace, built for the residence of Prince Henry, brother of the Great Frederick. It has been the favourite desire of the King to collect the ablest professors in Germany. The Faculty of Medicine is superior to any other in Germany; the Philosophical is not inferior; and the Theological is abler and better attended than any other, except that of Halle. Berlin has a decided preponderance as to evangelical religion, and it may be regarded as one of the strong holds of faith and true piety in Germany. Neander, the first ecclesiastical historian of the age, and perhaps the best exegetical lecturer on the New Testament, is the ornament of this University. The number of students in 1829 was somewhat over 1,800. The expense to a student for living, &c. was 360 rix dollars; generally speaking, they are of a superior rank to those that frequent other universities. It has

no separate library, but has the full use of the Royal one, which contains 180,000 volumes, and 7,000 MSS.

II. BONN was founded in 1818; it is rising fast to rank high with its elder sister; it is situated on the Rhine, where a large proportion of the population is Roman Catholic; therefore it has both a Protestant and Roman Catholic Faculty of Theology; a great portion of the Protestant Theological Faculty is evangelical; and in the region of country round about, there is a general prevalence of pure faith and practice. There are some learned men amongst the Roman Catholic professors. In the year 1830 there were 1000 students; amongst the theological students, the Roman Catholics were most numerous. The library contains 66,000 volumes.

III. BRESLAU, located in the capital of Silesia, was founded by the Jesuits in 1702. There is now both a Roman Catholic and Protestant Theological Faculty; the number of students 1,200; the library is an important one.

IV. ERLANGEN, the Protestant University of Bavaria, founded in 1743; it has a fine building, and funds amounting to 60,000 rix dollars a year. The number of students is on the decline; it has now only 431 students, of whom 207 are theologians. The library contains 100,000 volumes.

V. FRANKFURT in the Briesgau, the Roman Catholic University of Baden, founded in 1457; number of students, 600; it has a large library, rich in old books, collected from dissolved monasteries.

VI. GIESSEN, the University of Hesse Darmstadt, founded in 1607, has a yearly income of 60,000 florins.* The library contains 60,000 volumes. The students, 500.

VII. GÖTTINGEN was founded by George II. of England. It was established on its liberal plan by the celebrated minister, Von Münchhausen. The services of the ablest men were secured; and Mosheim, Haller, Michaelis, and their successors, Heyne, Blumenbach, and Eichhorn, are and have been amongst its ornaments. Thousands of young men have received education here, and it has been not only calculated to attract German students, but also foreigners, from the celebrity of its professors, and the liberal spirit which pervaded its lectures, and the gentlemanly tone which marked its society. Göttingen is rather on the decline as to the number of students; it contained in 1830, 1,300. The religious character and influence of the University of Göttingen may be summed up in a few words. Orthodoxy is *acknowledged* here, but not evangelical piety. In 1827, one of the *privatim doctores*, who had been in England, attempted to institute private religious meetings or conferences, but he was put down by the University, backed by the Government. The practice of the University is decidedly *against* evangelical truth and piety, and goes far to spread Rationalism. The library is one of the largest, and for practical uses, the best on the Continent; it contains

280,000 volumes. For the increase of it, the Government appropriates 8,000 rix dollars annually.

VIII. GRIERSWALDE, the smallest of the Prussian universities, is situated near the Baltic, and contains but 160 students.

IX. HALLE. In the history of theology, this has a peculiar claim to interest; it was founded in 1694, under the influence of the pious Spener. Spener caused that man of God, Francke, to be one of its first theological professors, and Halle became the centre of all his exertions, and the school of that pious and deep religious feeling which forms an era in the history of the German churches. The tone of piety and the teaching of truth began to give way with Baumgarten, and at length the foundations of faith in a Divine revelation were undermined by Semler. Nössel and some others still regarded themselves as orthodox; and within these few years, their cotemporary, the venerable Knapp, has closed a long life of inobtrusive but consistent piety; he stood however alone, while Rationalism, through the exertions of Wegscheider, and the countenance of Gesenius, had obtained firm footing, and seduced the great body of the students.

The translation of the eminently learned and pious Professor Tholuk from Berlin to Halle, gave occasion to open hostilities, and the principal members of the Theological Faculty protested against his coming, as being notoriously of different views and feelings from themselves. He came, however, and his amiable manners, combined with his uncommon learning, have, in a measure, tended to wear down the prejudices against him. He possesses a greater personal influence and reputation than any other living German theologian. Gesenius, the great Hebrew scholar, is professor here. The University has five theological classes. Gesenius lectures on the Old Testament; Wegscheider on the New; Tholuk or Weber on systematic theology; Tholo on ecclesiastical history; Mark on homiletic divinity. The philological department is filled by Schütz and Meier.

The number of students is on the increase; in 1829 there were 1330, of which 944 were students in theology. The cost of a residence here is from 200 to 250 rix dollars per annum. The library contains 40,000 volumes.

K. HEIDELBERG. This is the Protestant University of Baden, and is the oldest literary institution of Reformed Germany. It stands on the most picturesque part of the Rhine, where the Neckar forms a junction with it. Its celebrated library was carried off, when it was plundered by the Imperialists under Tilly, in 1620, and transferred to the Vatican; Paulus, one of the leading Rationalists of the day, at the advanced age of 70 years, lectures here, and seems daily more zealous to destroy the faith of Christian-believers. The number of students in 1829 was 602. The library still contains about 45,000 volumes.

XI. JENA is situated in Thuringia, about nine miles from Weimar. It contains about five thousand inhabitants, and its University was founded in 1558. Its reputation has suffered

much in recent times from the spirit of insubordination prevalent amongst its students. Here it was that Sands, the insane murderer of Kotzebue, imbibed his wild and licentious principles; and public opinion has supposed that his conduct was but the index of the views and feelings prevalent amongst the students. At present these prejudices are passing away, and Jena is not supposed to foster greater demagogues than other German colleges.

The Theological Faculty has had here a succession of eminent men: the Walchs, Griesbach, &c. &c. Eichhorn and Paulus commenced here their careers. Luden, the successor of Schiller in the chair of history, is one of the brightest names amongst the historians of Germany. The number of students has been from 500 to 600. Of the size of the library there is no specification.

XII. KIEL is strictly a German university, though, as in the province of Holstein, it belongs to the King of Denmark. It was founded in 1665; it has 380 students, and a library of 100,000 volumes.

XIII. KOENIGSBERG lies on the Baltic, in Prussia Proper. Its university was founded in 1544. In 1829, there were 441 students. This institution does not want for able professors; but in the theological department, some are infected with Rationalism. In the philosophical department, Herbart occupies the chair, once filled by the famous Kant. The library contains 60,000 volumes.

XIV. LEIPSIK was founded in 1409; it has always held a high rank amongst the schools of Germany; its annals are graced with the names of Gellert, Ernesti, Platner, Morus, Dathe, Keil. Amongst its present theological professors, are Tittmann and the younger Rosenmüller. The number of students in 1829 was 1,400. The library contains about 60,000 volumes, and 1,600 MSS.

XV. MARBURG is the oldest Protestant university, having been founded in 1527. The number of students in 1829 was 351. Its income is about 40,000 rix dollars. It has a library of 100,000 volumes.

XVI. MUNICH was founded in 1826, by the King of Bavaria, who was desirous to establish in South Germany one that might rival those of the North. The institution seems already very flourishing, for the number of students amounts to 1,600. The Theological Faculty is, of course, Roman Catholic. It was rumoured that a Protestant Faculty was to be established, but as yet it has not been done. The Royal Library is the largest in Germany, containing 400,000 volumes, and 8,500 MSS.

XVII. ROSTOCK is the University of Mecklenburg, and was founded in 1419, it has a library of 80,000 volumes, including the rare Oriental collection of the late Professor Tychem. It is the smallest of all the German universities, having only 150 students.

XVIII. TUBINGEN. This university has the reputation of being the only one which has not departed from the principles

and doctrines of the Reformation. The names of Storr, Bengel, and others, have given it a peculiar lustre and reputation amongst the friends of true religion. It was founded in 1477. There is a Roman Catholic Faculty of Theology here. In theology there are 226 Protestant students, and a 182 Roman Catholic. The library contains 130,000 volumes. In this university there is a peculiar institute or seminary for the education of theological students, to which we shall advert hereafter.

XIX. WUZZBURG, founded in 1403; it is a Roman Catholic university, and is most known as a school of medicine. It has a library of 100,000 volumes; and had, in 1829, 676 students, of whom 144 were theologians.

Such is the list of the universities at present existing in Germany, exclusive of the Austrian States, in which there are four, (of course Roman Catholic,) viz. Vienna, Prague, Pesth, and Innsbruck. We have not room to animadvert on these further than to observe cursorily that Vienna, as well as the other Austrian universities, differs from those of the other German States in being merely an extension or continuation of a gymnasium or great grammar school. Instead of freedom of choice amongst the courses of lecturers and professors, the youths must follow a prescribed course; and after a time they divide off into professions; the theologians pursue a specified course of four years—the jurists the same—the students of medicine five years; all these courses are followed by strict examinations, and no one can obtain a place in any department of government without a certificate of good conduct and diligent study. It is useless for any one to study at a foreign university, for every place of civil, medical, or theological emolument, is bestowed solely on the testimony of a *domestic* university. The study of all history, except that of Austria, has been lately excluded from the course. In the University of Vienna there are about 500 students. The University Library contains 80,000 volumes; besides, there is also the Imperial Library, containing 300,000 volumes, and a collection of MSS.

“From the preceding statements it appears that in the nineteen universities of Germany Proper, there are, on an average, constantly more than 15,000 students, in a population of about thirty millions. These are taught by more than 1000 professors and instructors. On the other hand, in a portion of the Austrian dominions, containing a population of eighteen millions, there are four universities, in which we cannot estimate the number of students at more than 3600. If now we inquire into the causes of this success in the German Protestant universities—for only three out of the nineteen—Freiburg, Munich, and Würzburg, are Catholic; and these are now conformed to the Protestant model—we shall probably be able to find them without difficulty, and be led at the same time to other interesting results.

“The first reason, and a very obvious one, is the small num-

ber of universities in comparison with the whole population; there being only nineteen for thirty millions. Prussia, with a population of thirteen millions, has six universities, with nearly 6000 students. If the same proportion between the population and the students were found in Austria as in Protestant Germany, her universities ought to contain no less than 9000 students; or rather, taking into account that the usual course in Austria is four years, instead of three, there ought to be 12000 students at her universities, instead of 3600. This fact serves to show the different spirit of these different portions of the great German family.

"A second reason is the circumstance to which allusion has already been made, that in Germany the intellectual energies have no outlet in the ordinary channels of an active, practical, business life. Since, therefore, the means of acquiring external influence are in a great measure cut off, men of aspiring minds are driven to the cultivation of literature and science, as the only remaining means of acquiring fame and influence and profit. Indeed, for such as wish to obtain posts of trust and emolument, the regulation is compulsory, as we shall see more fully below. But in regard to all those who are not aiming at offices under government, if any such there be, the same necessity is laid upon them. In the whole of Germany there exists, for instance, no opportunity whatever of addressing a public assembly, except from the pulpit. The proceedings of all the courts of justice are private, and are mostly conducted in writing. Deliberative assemblies exist only in the few states which have the semblance of a constitution, and their sittings are never public. Popular eloquence, the eloquence of the bar, the eloquence of the senate, these mighty engines in kindling the spirit and arousing the energies of a nation, are to a German inaccessible and unknown. He has no opportunity of thus acting upon others, nor of being himself thus acted upon. He can come before the public only through the medium of the press; and hence it probably in a great measure arises that the German press is so prolific; inasmuch as the ten thousand visionary schemes and projects, which in this country are thrown out in the ardour of public speaking, or in the ephemeral columns of a newspaper, must there assume the more permanent form of magazines and books.

"A third and more efficient reason than all others for the concourse of students at the universities of Germany, arises from the nature of the governments, and the relation which the universities sustain to them. It has been already remarked that the various governments of Germany are in all their essential features despotic.

The sovereigns of Germany universally hold the whole power in their hands; and there is not a place of honour or profit, from the minister of state down to the petty schoolmaster of a village, which is not directly or indirectly dependent on the government. Every lawyer is one, only so far as he is connected with the

courts of justice, as an officer of lower or higher rank and name; every physician is one, only so far as he has the license and the sanction of the proper department; the church itself is but the slave of the civil power, and must do all its bidding. No man can devote himself to the service of his Divine Master, and proclaim salvation to the perishing souls of his fellow-men, but in the way which the government directs. Were he to attempt it, without having yielded obedience to all the prescribed formalities, there is not a spot in Germany where imprisonment or banishment would not be his lot. The government mixes itself in every thing, prescribes every thing, will know every thing, and prohibits every thing which does not strictly coincide with its own interests and will.

In this system of things, the universities act a conspicuous and necessary part. They have been established, and are supported by the governments, as seminaries to train up and qualify young men for the offices of church and state—those offices which the governments alone can give, and which, as a universal rule, they give only to such as have received a university education. No one is permitted even to ask for an office in the state, or a station in the church, or for employment in the courts, or for practice as a physician, unless he has been at a university. This is *a sine qua non*, a previous question, which, if answered in the negative, precludes all other questions. The only exceptions are in the case of village schoolmasters and the department of mines; for both of which there are special seminaries, which take the place of a university course. The universities, then, are interwoven with the very system of government; they form an essential feature in its policy; and from the very nature of their relation to it, they must for ever remain under its immediate control.

It is easy to see, however, that this state of things must have a prodigious influence on the character of society; that while the governments thus act directly in augmenting the number of those who frequent the universities, they afford in this way an opportunity for the universities to react upon the governments and upon the people, by exerting and cherishing a love of literature and science, and a spirit of liberal inquiry and deep investigation, in those who are to be the future servants of the church and nation—who are to be the guardians of the health, the protectors and interpreters of the rights, and the shepherds and bishops of the souls, of millions of their fellow-men. Such was once Wittenberg, and it produced the Reformation. Impressed with the magnitude of these considerations, how should Christians be constrained to pray without ceasing, that these fountains may again be cleansed; that pure and undefiled religion and morality may again prevail and abound there; and thus these institutions become once more, what they once have been, a rich blessing to the church and to the world."

(To be continued.)

ON CONFORMITY TO THE WORLD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—If you should consider the following observations as deserving a place in the *CHRISTIAN EXAMINER*, they are at your service. They were written by me, some time ago, in answer to the communication of a pious lady, who expressed a wish for my opinion on the subject to which they allude, namely, whether persons of fortune should or should not lay down the usual appendages of their rank and station.

Conformity to the world, as it relates to the mind, is a subject upon which one can think and speak with clearness, because the Scriptures, in repeated passages, are explicit upon the point. But, in fact, the whole spirit of God's revelation forbids us to mingle in taste or sympathy with the world. Indeed I have considered a total extrication of the heart from the whole system around us to be the very essence of salvation. Our great trial seems, in a word, to be this: two objects of attraction present themselves to our view—the world and Christ. In every respect these two rivals are the opposites of one another; we cannot love them both; we cannot serve two masters. If the glittering vanities of earth engage our affections, where our heart is, there will be our treasure, and to the world we must look as our only hope; but if the invisible glories of the Redeemer are revealed to our faith, to them we shall infallibly cleave; this golden chain let down from heaven, if we lay hold on it, will draw us up into the regions of the blessed.

As to that conformity to the world which respects our outward conduct, I have always considered that the best guide in that matter is the inward disconformity already spoken of. That the dissipated amusements, as well as the vicious habits of the world, should be relinquished by every serious person, is my decided opinion; but to what extent and in what particulars any further separation is to take place must, I think, be left to each individual, looking to God with a single eye in prayer. So much depends on the constitution of each mind, the particular connections, the station in life, and the endless varieties which distinguish one man's circumstances and responsibilities from another's, that it is impossible to lay down any external rule. Let each Christian do as he is persuaded in his own mind, and if his intention is right, his errors in judgment cannot be important. There is one point on which I cannot help, however, making some observations here. Some sincerely religious persons contend that those whom Providence has entrusted with large possessions, and placed in high station, should dismiss the usual accompaniments of their rank in life, and come down to the habits of their humbler brethren. Costly furniture, expensive equipage, and large establishments, they in the lump condemn, as unsuitable to the fol-

lowers of a crucified Saviour, and as sinful pomps and vanities, which, as Christians, we have solemnly renounced. Now, if I know my own heart, I am as incapable of opposing such notions on any worldly principle as I am of openly denying the Lord that bought me. Nevertheless I do most deeply dissent from them on the following grounds:—

1st. It would reduce to poverty a large proportion of industrious tradesmen, whose principal business it is to provide for what are called the superfluities of the wealthy. If all are to adopt a plain style of living, what is to become of those employed in ornamental furniture, coach-building, jewellery, &c. &c.? The system contended for would reduce the industrious, in numberless instances, to poverty, and then relieve them.

2dly. It would destroy one of the evidences of the truth of revealed religion, namely, the unity of plan between the God revealed in Scripture and the invisible Ruler of the world. Distinction of rank could not be preserved without distinction of living; and if gradations in society be manifestly the arrangement of Providence, and if Christianity condemns them, then Providence and Christianity are opposed to one another.

3dly. Were this system carried into effect, it would be destructive of some of the most amiable and genuine fruits of true religion, such as affability and condescension in superiors, and that respectful deference which inferiors show to them. I again repeat that station cannot be kept up without external accompaniments; and it is my firm belief that a large proportion of those graces which assimilate us most to Christ, and constitute our preparation for future happiness, are drawn out into exercise by precisely the very thing which the principle I object to would prostrate. Humility, above all things, is intimately connected with such arrangements of society. I scarcely know how it could have materials to act on without them. Suppose two children of God, dear to one another as such, but placed in totally different ranks of life; in the intercourse of such persons, if they be true and genuine Christians, humility will, on both sides, be in constant exercise; and it is impossible to say on which side the exhibition will be most lovely, whether of the superior, who treats the other as his brother in Christ, and as his equal, or above his equal, in the kingdom of God—or the inferior, who, so far from presuming upon his spiritual privileges, counts his superior worthy of double respect and honour, because he is a brother “faithful and beloved, and partaker of the benefit.” These interchanges have, perhaps, as much of the soft and genial influences from above in them as any which take place between man and man. And all these would, I am persuaded, be in a great measure done away, if the ornamental distinctions of rank were to cease. We are not creatures of mere reason, we are creatures of feeling also, and the bare conviction that station was vested with political authority would have comparatively little influence, if it were unaccompanied by pomp and circumstance.

4th. Were the principle admitted, that Christianity requires us to desert the stations, or the habits of the stations, in which we find ourselves placed by Providence, then farewell to that repose of heart which the Christian feels in the consideration that not he, but a wisdom higher than his own, is to choose his situation. The spirit which would call on men to take so much upon themselves, and to take their concerns into their own hands, has more of "voluntary humility" than of deep submission to the will of God.

5th. Lastly, my main objection to that system which demands that the great and wealthy should refuse, as Christian disciples, to conform to whatever degree of state in living may ordinarily attend their rank, is, that the whole seems to me to be founded on a false interpretation of the word of God. Our Lord's declaration that his kingdom was not of this world has, I believe, a meaning not in favour of, but directly opposed to, such views as would change or interfere with existing arrangements of society. It is not the province of Christianity to regulate in this department. It is not of this world; because the one is visible and external, while the other is in its essence an inward frame of soul. Its business with the rich is not to point out how large their houses ought be, or how many servants or carriages they should keep, but to teach them not to trust in uncertain riches; to condescend to men of low estate; to open their hearts in compassion to the poor; and, in the midst of all outward appendages of rank, to be in mind and spirit dead to every solicitation of vanity, and crucified to the world. I feel persuaded that those men who, with unsparing hand, would cut down all the superfluities (as they call them, but in reality the providential distinctions) of high station, do not raise, but lower the standard of Christian holiness. They substitute outward and endless scruples for the deep spirituality of the Gospel. They disturb the conscience with doubts, where a clearer light would give that peace of God which passeth all understanding. They do, I firmly believe, entirely mistake the intention of those passages of Scripture which call on us to forsake all that we have, &c. &c. They finally look for a kind of extrication from the world, which is not what the Bible means. What the Bible means is the extrication of the soul, and not of the body; the deep separation of the heart, and not the visible mark or badge of any party. This is the real spirit of our religion, the life which is hid with Christ in God, the Christian's victory over the world.

H. W.

THE HISTORY OF THE ASSASSINS.

More than fifteen years have elapsed since the illustrious Von Hammer published his "*Geschichte des Assassinen*," as a kind of historical monograph, to stimulate scholars to research in Oriental literature, and to shew the world what valuable treasures that literature contained. Within that period the indefatigable labours of Baron de Sacy, Renand, Quatremere, and Percival, in France—of Kozgarten and Rosenmüller, in Germany—of Rasmussen, in Denmark—and of the members of the Oriental Translation Committee, in England, have added immense stores to our previous information on the subject, have supplied much that was deficient, explained much that was obscure, and harmonized much that seemed inconsistent. We take advantage, therefore, of the appearance of a French translation of Von Hammer's work, published within the last few months, and enriched with some valuable notes, to enter on the investigation of a subject, which, from the extent of recent additions, has a fair claim to be regarded as a novelty.

There is no word in more common use than "*Assassin*;" it has been naturalized in every European language from the Ural mountains to the Atlantic Ocean; every school-boy knows the romantic tale of *Eleanora* having saved the life of her husband, when wounded by the poisoned dagger of the genuine *Assassina*. "*Children of larger growth*" have, by a thousand tales and fictions, been made acquainted with the dreadful name of the *Old Man of the Mountain*; while the grave and the learned have taken a deep interest in determining whether "*the lion-hearted Richard*" was or was not an accessory to the murder of the *Marquis of Montmorat*, who was slain by an emissary of the fearful mountain-chief. Interesting to all these as a history of the *Assassins* must be, the gratification of such curiosity is one of the least merits belonging to the subject. "*This strange eventful history*" is connected with the account of the first corruptions that sullied the purity of primitive Christianity; nay, its links ascend to the days of *Zoroaster* and *Darius Hystaspes*, but more intimately is it connected with the origin and progress of the *Mohammedan heresy**—with the course of those wars misnamed "*holy*"—with the Syrian sects that have for ages rendered life and property insecure throughout the greater part of Asiatic Turkey, and with the great moral revolution that is working a rapid change in all the lands where Islam is established.

The *Assassins* were a branch of the *Ismaelian* sect, one of the earliest, the most formidable, and the most pernicious, heresies that sprung up within the bosom of *Mohammedanism*. Like *Alexander the Great*, the founder of *Islam* died without publicly naming

* "*Mohammedanism began as a Christian heresy.*"—*Dr. Mede.*

a successor—publicly, we say, because it is firmly believed by the Shiites that he made a will in favour of his son-in-law, Ali, which was suppressed. Nor is the Shiite tradition improbable; the last days of Mahommed's life were spent alone with his wife, Ayesha, a woman whom boundless ambition, intense hatred of Ali, and the more honourable motive of grateful affection, prompted to change the order of succession. She was the favourite wife of the Prophet, and as such had long been regarded as Queen of Arabia, a station which she was unwilling to resign to her step-daughter, Fatima. When an unfortunate combination of circumstances threw suspicion on her character, Ali had been foremost in promulgating calumnies, which her husband could only check by pretending that her innocence was made the subject of a special revelation; finally her father, who had the next claim after Ali, had paid her the unusual compliment of taking a name from his daughter, and after her marriage with Mohammed, uniformly called himself Abú Bekr, "the Father of the Virgin." She proclaimed that the Prophet "died and made no sign." After a few days of confusion, Ali was set aside, and Abú Bekr elected the successor of Mohammed.

The new governor of the Saracens, as the Arabs began about this time to be called, took the title of Khaliph, or "Vicar;" he was not only the *Emír al Momínin*, "Prince of the Believers," but also the *Imám al Moslímín*, "Head of those who professed Islám, or perfect submission to the divine will;" that is, he united in his person both temporal and spiritual authority. From the very beginning, however, a strong party, including the greater proportion of Mohammed's family and immediate friends, held that spiritual power could not be conferred by election; that the dignity of Imám had been bestowed upon Ali by divine command, and that it was hereditary in his family. This was the origin of the Shiite sect, which is the prevailing one in Persia and part of Northern India. During the reign of the amiable and tolerant Abú Bekr, these opinions were promulgated without let or hindrance; but when the ferocious Omar assumed the Khaliphate, the followers of Ali were terrified into silence, and forced to propagate their opinions in secret. It was under Omar, justly named Al-Furúk, "the Terrible," that Mohammedanism assumed that character of bigotry, ferocity, and despotism, by which it has been since distinguished; it was under him that the military power of the Saracens became an object of terror in the remotest regions of the East and West; that the throne of the Sassanides, in Persia, was tumbled into ruins; and that of the Constantinians, in Byzantium, shaken to its foundation. Omar was a consistent bigot; he declared himself the open foe of learning and intelligence, and constructed an *Index Expurgatorius*, of which all subsequently published are but very humble imitations. By his command the magnificent library of Alexandria was used to heat the public baths; and the splendid collection of Persian Records, collected by the Sassanid monarchs in their magnificent metropolis, Ctesi-

phon, were hurled into the waters of the Tigris, and choked its channel.* He ordained that the Korán should be the rule of life for the faithful; and that where it was defective, recourse should be had to the Sónna, or collection of traditions, ascribed to Mohammed; and it is from this circumstance that the orthodox Mussulmans are now called Sónnites, or Sónnees.

"Beware of the Persian fables," said Mohammed to his followers, with whose love of the marvellous he was well acquainted—"Beware of the Persian doctrines," repeated Omar, who found they made rapid but secret progress among his followers. To explain the nature of their terrors we must ascend to ages of remote antiquity—investigate an age of which the historical records are few, and those few contradictory—and offer plausible conjecture, because certainty is unattainable.

From an age so remote that history preserves no record of it, a religion has prevailed in the countries north and east of India, derivable, by logical sequence, from the doctrines that prevail in India itself, and yet completely opposed to them; because all false doctrines become inconsistent when pursued to their remote consequence. The leading tenet of this religion is belief in one or more *Bodhiawatas*, that is, incarnations of the deity Buddha, or Buddha; the essential feature of its discipline is, that the priesthood forms an order, not a caste; its ceremonial is so strangely similar to that of the Romish Church, that the first Jesuit missionaries who visited central Asia declared that Buddhism was a corruption of Christianity; and when driven from that position by the unanswerable argument of dates, gravely asserted that it was invented by the devil, as an anticipatory parody of the true church!! Buddhism came recommended to princes by the support it afforded to the royal authority, boldly maintaining the right of royal supremacy over the sacerdotal, as well as over every other *caste*; but it was also formidable to sovereigns, from the encouragement it afforded to monastic orders, to affiliated societies, to secret communities bound together by solemn oaths of brotherhood and concealment. In the sixth century before Christ an attempt seems to have been made to bring both the doctrines and institutions of Buddhism into Western Europe; at least the doctrine of the Metempsychosis is closely allied to that of the Bodhiawata, and the secret societies of the Pythagoreans to the affiliated monastic orders of Asia. About the same time we know, from the unerring testimony of Scripture, confirmed indeed by the concurrent voice of profane history, that a mighty revolution changed the entire face of Central and Western Asia. Its leader is known to us by the name of Cyrus, but whether that was his proper name, or an epithet, seems un-

* As some doubts have been cast on the authenticity of these anecdotes, it is right to state that they are supported by the authority of Macrisi, Ebn Khaldún, and Hajji Khalifa.

certain. Like most, if not all, Oriental conquerors, he effected a religious as well as political change, asserting strongly the doctrine of the Divine Unity; hence his favour to the Jews, and his remarkable partiality for the prophet Daniel. It would be too long a digression were we to state our reasons for believing the Medes to have been a *caste* rather than a nation; we must hasten to another part of the subject.

The son of Cyrus subdued Egypt; in that country he showed himself a fierce persecutor of the priestly caste, destroying their temples, and slaying their sacred bull, the well-known object of Egyptian as well as of Brahminical adoration.

On the death of Cambyses, a second revolution restored the power of the priestly caste, and this is all that can be deduced with certainty from the history of the impostor Smerdis. The caste of the nobles or warriors, the Pasargadae, however, rose against the usurper, and placed one of their number, Gushtasp, or, as the Greeks call him, Darius Hystaspes, upon the throne. In his reign there appeared a religious reformer, born in that part of the Persian empire which joins the Buddhistic countries, who proclaimed himself to be a Bodhiwata, and required his laws to be received as the immediate commands of deity. This legislator was named Zerdusht, or Zoroaster. A tolerably accurate outline of his system may be found in the Zend-Avesta, whose authenticity is now generally recognized; but our only business is to remark that all we know of the discipline established by Zoroaster, all his gradations of priestly rank, and all his ecclesiastical canons, are precisely the same as those now found to exist in Buddhistic countries. Let any person, desirous of making the comparison, read Newmann's Translation of the Catechism of the Shamans, and contrast its chapters with the *Fargards* of the Zend-Avesta.

Alexander conquered the empire and persecuted the religion of the Persians, for which he is honoured by the Mahomedans as a saint, and described, in the Parsee books, as an actual incarnation of Satan or Abriman. His successors, the Seleucids, provoked a rebellion in Persia, and the Maccabean war in Judea, by pursuing his policy. A race of princes, from North-western Persia, became the lords of Central Asia, a race well known as the Arsacid or Parthian dynasty. While the Arsacids ruled, the name of Persia was lost in that of Parthia; the religion of Zoroaster, though tolerated, was not encouraged, and the customs of Greece were preferred to those of Asia. These princes were not national in feelings or manners, and probably belonged not to any Persian family; they were honourably distinguished from all cotemporary sovereigns by the adoption of universal toleration. In their states, Pagans found refuge from Christians, Christians from Pagans, Jews from both, and sects from each other. When was truth allowed "a clear stage and no favour" that it did not mightily prevail? At the beginning of the third century Christianity had made very extensive progress in Persia, and might be regarded as the prevailing creed in the western provinces.

A new revolution occurred A.D. 226, whose history, notwithstanding the valuable labours of Baron de Sacy and Sir John Malcolm, remains yet to be written. The followers of Zerdusht rushed from the mountains of Irán, whither they had been driven by Macedonian persecution, and where they remained neglected by Parthian indifference. They chose for their leader Ardesbis Babegan, a prince of the house of Sassan, which claimed descent from Cyrus. That strange national standard, the apron of the blacksmith, Gáváh waved triumphant in every field. The dreaded Parthians

"Dropped from their nerveless arms the shatter'd spear,
Closed their bright eyes, and curb'd their high career."

The national language, religion, and customs, of Persia, were restored by Ardesbis, and successful efforts were made to revive the national literature; but the Magian religion, as that taught by Zoroaster is commonly called, came the second time from the mountains that had been its cradle, deeply tinged with the darker shades of Buddhism. To fanaticism the Sassanides owed their crown; by stimulating fanaticism they resolved to sustain their empire, and a fierce persecution was raised against all who refused to worship the sacred fire. The progress of Christianity was instantly checked eastwards, and it was thrown back upon the west. Every one knows the fierce wars that arose between the Christian emperors of Byzantium and the Magian rulers of Ctesiphon; and how the Jews, joining with the latter, exacted a deadly revenge for the persecutions they had endured from the Christians in Syria.

In the middle of the third century an attempt was made to form a new religion, by the amalgamation of Christianity, Magianism, and Buddhism, in which, however, the latter predominated. The daring propounder of this novelty is usually named Mani, or Manes; but most writers agree that this was not his real name, though they have been generally unable to account for its adoption. We think, however, that Archbishop Ussher has fairly proved that Manes is the Greek form of *Manahem*, which in the Semitic languages signifies an advocate or paraclete, and that the impostor took that name in order to found on it a claim to be the Paraclete promised by Jesus Christ. This conjecture is greatly corroborated by the recent researches of Bopp and Lassen, who have shown that, though the Zend or old Persian is a pure offshoot of the Sanscrit, yet the Pehlvi, which prevailed under the Sassanides, was corrupted by a large admixture of words from the Aramaic dialects. Sir Graves Chamney Haughton, one of the ablest Orientalists in England, whose extensive knowledge is equalled by his generous readiness to impart information, told us, a few days since, that Pehlvi signifies properly "the border language," being derived from the Persian word which signifies "a side," and which is also the root of the Persian word for "a warrior or hero." The Euphrates, as we

all know, was the common boundary of those families of language called by German writers Semitic and Japetic; the Pehlvi dialect was probably formed on the banks of that river.

To return from our philological digression: Mani pretended to be a new Bodhiswata, and acquired great influence over his followers: he appears to have been the first that introduced the notion of "Christ's Vicar upon earth," or "a visible head of the Church" among Christians. The idea was clearly derived from the Buddhists, for to this day the Tibetans regard their Lamas as successive Bodhiswatas. The idea, as we all know, was brought into Western Europe, where it received development that need not be characterized.

Mani was finally put to death by the Magian priests. Another impostor, who made the same pretences, met the same fate in the succeeding century; but still there were others found to make similar attempts. Mirkbond, though his history of the Sassanid dynasty is very brief, notices how frequently in their age religious impostors appeared; he is also careful to inform us that Mani had long travelled in Buddhistic countries, and that most, if not all of his imitators came from Eastern Persia, that is, from the part which joins the regions of Buddhism. It deserves also to be mentioned, that the partisans of many of these impostors disbelieved the fact of their death, asserting that these Bodhiswatas remained invisible on earth, and would appear at some future period to assume the empire of the universe. Indeed we learn from respectable Oriental authority, that a sect of the Jews in Persia believed Ezra to be thus an "invisible Vicar of the Divinity," destined at some time or other to make Jerusalem the seat of universal empire; and it is to this opinion Mohammed alludes, when he accuses the Jews of believing Ezra to be the Messiah.

We are now able to understand what were the fables against which Mohammed protested—what were the doctrines whose progress Omar dreaded. The Persians inclined to favour the pretensions of Ali, because they had just reason to hate the cruel Omar, mixed up his claim to the be Imám al Moslemin with their own popular notion of a Bodhiswata, or *Terrasch*, as they called it; and a sect sprung up that regarded Ali as a more divine personage than Mohammed himself. We have not space to detail the sanguinary struggle that terminated in the overthrow of the Khaliphate, within the fatal period of thirty years, as Mohammed had by a felicitous conjecture predicted. During the fierce contests for secular power that convulsed Western Asia, the singular doctrines of the *Terrasch* daily acquired new strength. Babek and Karmath propagated them

* See Ochley, Price, or, if the writer may be permitted to quote *quiddam notum propriumque*, the History of Mohammedanism, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

openly, declaring themselves incarnations of the Divinity, and winning proselytes by teaching the alluring doctrines of the indifference of human actions, and the community of all possessions. The atrocities committed by these wretches and their disciples, the dreadful devastations and the havoc that ensued, are well known to the readers of Oriental history. But even their bad fame is eclipsed by that of Hakem-ebn-Hasehem, universally celebrated under the name of Mokanna, that is, "the wearer of the veil." Moore inaccurately fixes the origin of this sect—

In that delightful province of the sun
The first of Persian lands he shines upon,
Where all the loveliest children of his beam,
Flowrets and fruits blush over every stream.

Mokanna's career began, not in Khorassan, but in Transoxiana, among those tribes where Buddhism, under some form or other, has prevailed from the remotest ages. The wild and wondrous tale of Mokanna's career need not be narrated; his extraordinary death, and the horrible persecutions to which his followers were subjected, form the strangest as well as the darkest period in Oriental history.

"The Persians," says Macrisi in his *Khitât*, "have always, looked upon themselves as the most free and civilized nation of the universe, and regarded all others as ignorant slaves. When their empire was overturned by the Arabs, they regarded their conquerors with hatred and contempt; they endeavoured to overthrow the edifice of Islamism, not merely by open war, but by diffusing pernicious and secret doctrines which necessarily produced rebellions." The Persians had aided all the false prophets that appeared during the three first centuries of Islamism, but they had been cruelly punished, and warned by such calamities, the founder of the next sect resolved to promulgate his doctrines in secret.

We have already noticed the belief that the Divine dignity of Imám was hereditary in the family of Ali; his unfortunate sons Hassan and Hossein were deemed his legitimate successors; Ali, son of Hossein, was the fourth Imám, Mohammed, son of Ali, the fifth, and ~~Ali~~ ^{Giafar}, son of Mohammed, the sixth. Giafar, whom the Persian traditions represent as a second Solomon, seems to have adopted and promulgated many of the doctrines which the enemies of Islám taught. He used to say to his disciples, "Consult me whilst I remain with you; after me there will be no teacher able to give you instruction." He nominated for his successor his eldest son Ismaíl, but on his premature death he transferred the Imámite to his son Mûsa. Now Ismaíl had left children, and several held that as the dignity of Imám was hereditary, his son should have succeeded. Superstition changed the assertion of these political rights into a religious dogma; it was held that seven being a perfect and sacred number, that the Imámite received its completion in the person of Ismaíl, the seventh Imám; that he was not dead, but withdrawn from the

world, to re-appear at some future time, and consummate the triumph of his religion; but that in the mean time temporal power belonged of right to his descendants and to all who believed in him. Those who received this doctrine were called Ismaelians, but at a later period they received the name of Assassins.

The doctrine of the *Mahdi*, or invisible Imám, who is finally to rule the earth, is not peculiar to the Ismaelians; it is believed by all the Persians of the present day, only that their Mahdi is the twelfth instead of the seventh Imám. It is also the doctrine of the Druses, in Syria; but they have, with singular folly, chosen for their Mahdi, Al Hakem, the most stupid and tyrannical of the Egyptian Kaliphs. The doctrine of the Ismaelians has long since disappeared in Persia, because the Suffavean dynasty, or, as our ancestors called them, the Sophis, the most popular race of monarchs in that country since the age of the Saracenic Khaliphs—claimed descent from Músa, the second son of Giafar, and consequently used every exertion to discourage the pretensions of Ismail.

The Secret Society of the Ismaelians was founded by Abdallah, the son of Maimún, a native of Ahwas, in Southern Persia; his family had been distinguished for obstinate adherence to the dualism of the Magian religion, and he was urged by hereditary hatred, by patriotism, and ambition, to seek the destruction both of the creed and the empire of the Arabs. Several progressive stages were established in the Ismaelian lodges; strict subordination was taught; the companion (Refik) was induced to look forward with anxiety to the day when he should become a missionary (Dai); and he was taught implicit obedience to the Dai-al-Doat, or Chief of the Ismaelian College, "*de propagandá*." Notwithstanding the unfortunate termination of the Karmathian rebellion, which had been raised by Karmath, an Ismaelian convert, who substituted open force for the secret policy of his sect, the Ismaelians acquired so much strength that in the tenth century of the Christian era, and the fourth of the Hegira, they were able to establish a new dynasty on the throne of Egypt. This race of monarchs is known in history by the name of the Fatemite Khaliphs, because they pretended to be descended from Ismail the seventh Imám, and through him from Fatima, the wife of Ali and daughter of Mohammed. In consequence of this revolution the Ismaelians were permitted to establish a great lodge at Cairo, which became the centre of their seat.

Macrisi, whose inestimable work on Egypt is preparing for publication by Abraham Salamé, Esq., under the superintendence of the Oriental Translation Committee, give us a full and particular account of the nine gradations through which the affiliated Ismaelians passed in the "House of Wisdom," as the great lodge was named. The first, or initiatory degree, taught only the duty of submission and the advantages of knowledge; in the second, the nature of the Imámate was revealed; in the third, it was

shown that the number of Imáms was only seven; and in the fourth was taught the dependence of religion on the number seven, and traces of the dogmas taught in this stage are still to be found in every Mohammedan country. The Ismaelians declared that since the beginning of the world there had been seven Bodhiswas, or incarnations of divine legislators, who had successively modified the doctrine of their predecessors. These all had been endowed with "the gift of speech," that is, with power to promulgate a code; and to each there had been assigned "mute attendants," that is, vicars, whose duty it was to enforce the observance of the code; in other words, Popes or Imáms. The seven divine legislators were Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, Mohammed, and Ismaïl; the seven vicars or popes were Shem, Ishmael, Aaron, Simon or Simeon, Ali, and Mohammed, the son of Ismaïl.

In the succeeding degrees the precepts and doctrines of religion were explained away by the aid of philosophic mysticism, until at the ninth stage, the Dai was taught the indifference, not only of actions, but of creeds, in short, "to believe nothing and dare everything."

In the middle of the eleventh century, which nearly coincides with the fifth of the Hegira, the Ismaelian doctrines received their complete development from Hassan-ebn-Sabah, one of those extraordinary men of whom, like Cromwell and Mohammed, it is difficult to pronounce whether they should be regarded as enthusiasts or impostors. His family came originally from Tus, in Khorassan, the old source of Buddhistic corruptions, and settled at Rey, the ancient Rhagæ, the scene of the principal transactions recorded in the book of Tobit. Suspicions had been thrown on the orthodoxy of his father, who, anxious to remove them, sent his son to the celebrated college of Neschabûr. Among the companions of his studies, Hassan found Nezam-al-Molc and Omar Khiám. Between the three youths, destined, at no distant period, to play an important part in the world, Hassan as First Grand Master of the Assassins, Nezam-al-Molc as vizier of the celebrated Malek-sháh, and Omar Khiám as a poet and astronomer, an agreement was made that the first who acquired exalted station, should provide for the fortune of his companions. When Nezam became vizier to the Seljukian princes, he offered his assistance to Khiám; but the poet, a noted lover of ease and pleasure, refused to encounter the storms of politics; the vizier then introduced Hassan at court, but soon finding in him a dangerous and subtle foe, he compelled him to seek safety by flight. During his concealment Hassan boasted to his host that, with the aid of only two faithful friends, he would overthrow the Turk and the clownish peasant, that is, the Sultan and his minister. The host, at the time, believed him mad, but subsequent events revealed the dire import of the expression.

Hassan, who had been long an Ismaelian Dai, at length resolved to visit Egypt. His fame in the lodge must have been

great, for, though as yet scarcely known to the public, he was received with all the honours of a sovereign prince by the Fati-mite Khaliph. From thence he was driven by a new revolution into Syria, and for some time he wandered in secret through western Asia, daily adding to the number of his proselytes. At length, A.D. 1090, in the 485th year of the Hegira, taking advantage of the distractions occasioned by the Seljukian wars, he siezed the mountain-castle of Alamoot, that is, the eagle's nest, and made it the centre of his power.

The Assassins in Syria, and the Jesuits in Paraguay, are the only examples of a perfect system of government founded and conducted by an Order. The Templars are accused of having meditated some such design; the Knights of Malta enjoyed for a time the mockery of empire; but never did the chivalry of the white or red cross meditate such mastery as was actually enjoyed by the followers of Hassan and Loyola.

On referring to the map, the reader will see a chain of mountains running to the south of the Caspian, whose branches extend through Syria to the very shores of the Mediterranean; the summits of these were crowned by castles, erected by the followers of Hassan. Alamoot, the cradle and the metropolis of their power, was in the district of Rudbár, north of the city Casbin or Kaswin. From this circumstance the Grand Master of the Assassins was named Sheikh-al-Jebal, or Prince of the Mountainous District, which was inaccurately translated "The Old Man of the Mountain." The next step in this history presents a curious mixture of fact and fable which it is difficult to disentangle. To account for the ease with which Hassan acquired Alamoot, the Oriental historians say that he had recourse to the artifice of the bull's hide by which Dido got possession of Carthage. This story must be very popular in the East, for a Turkish Effendi assured us the other day that it was by this means the English got possession of Gibraltar; and every man between the Tigris and Ganges ascribes our occupation of Calcutta to the same artifice. This fable needs no refutation. Hassan introduced a new grade among the Assassins, called that of Fedayies, or "Devoted;" these men, as it is well known, encountered every possible danger, and even committed suicide at the slightest intimation of the Grand Master's pleasure. To account for their utter recklessness of life, surpassing even Oriental disregard of death, we are told that the Sheikh-al-Jebal used to administer an opiate to his followers, and then remove them to a garden, where, on waking, they found themselves surrounded by every sensual enjoyment; again the opiate was administered, they were brought back to the castle, and persuaded that they had obtained a foretaste of paradise. De Sacy and Von Hammer explained this by saying that the Sheikh-al-Jebal administered to his followers an intoxicating liquor obtained from hemp, call *hashish*, which produced the most glorious visions of happiness, and that, from the use of this beverage, the Ismaelians were called *Hashishim* or *Assassins*.

We do not feel quite satisfied with this derivation; in the first place, the story of the terrestrial paradise is nothing more than a repetition of the old traditions respecting the impious Sheddád and the gardens of Irem, which the reader will find in the introduction to Sale's Koran, or the Thousand and One Nights; secondly, the Hashish is nothing better than bad brandy, much more likely to produce head-aches than beatific visions; and finally, there is a sober determinateness of purpose in all the actions ascribed to the Assassins that could never have resulted from intoxication. We, therefore, incline to the old opinion that the Assassins derived their name from Hassan, the first Grand Master.

Hassan was neither prince nor king; his government was that of an order or confraternity, like that of the Jesuits in Paraguay, or the Knights Hospitallers in Malta. As his dominions increased, he appointed Dai-al-Kebir, or Grand Priors, to rule in Syria and Kúhistán. The neighbouring princes did not at first pay much attention to the growth of this new power, which they seemed to regard as merely resulting from the desultory efforts of a few fanatical mountaineers, but they sent some detachments of their armies to recover the castles. These were forced to retire with loss; and the Seljukian Sultan, at length discovering his mistake, sent his best general, Arslan Tash (*the lion of stone*) to recover the fortress of Alamoot. Hassan made a desperate and protracted resistance; but finding that his enemies were still undaunted, he had recourse to his new power, and his Fedavies were, for the first time, sent out as missionaries of assassination. The first victim was Nezam-al-Molk, the old schoolfellow of Hassan, the vizier to the three first Seljukian Sultans, Togrul, Alp-Arslan, and Melek-Sháh. His death was followed by that of the Sultan himself; it was asserted that Melek-Sháh had been poisoned by a Fedavi, and Hassan gave circulation to a story which increased the terror of his name. In the confusion that followed, Hassan made himself master of several new fortresses, amongst others of Sháh-Dúz, (*the royal pearl*), recently erected by the Sultan Melek-Sháh.

The Oriental writers give a strange account of this fortress; They tell us, that when Melek-Sháh was hunting one day, in company with the Byzantine ambassador, a dog, straying from the pack, led them to discover a table of rock which commanded the surrounding country. On this the Greek envoy remarked that if his master had so favourable a position he would take advantage of it to erect a fortress. The Sultan was pleased with the hint, and the rock was soon crowned with the formidable castle of Sháh-Dúz. When it fell into the hands of the Ismaelians, it was remarked that "better fortune could not have been expected for a place whose position had been indicated by a dog, and whose erection had been advised by an infidel."

But the Assassins were not the only enemies that now threatened the destruction of Islamism; the shores of the Levant were

covered with ships, bringing Christian fanatics to attempt the recovery of Palestine; the mountain passes of Asia Minor, after a long lapse of ages, found their solitudes disturbed by men who encountered unparalleled dangers and difficulties to force their way to the Holy Land. Nearly at the same moment the Assassins appeared in the east and the Crusaders in the west of Syria. Had they acted in concert, the fate of Mohammedanism was sealed; but they were actuated by different species of fanaticism, and its species have as much repugnancy to mixture as oil and water.

A fierce persecution was raised against all who were suspected of adhering to the Ismaelian doctrines in every Mohammedan country; like every other persecution, it only increased the power of the sect. But the Assassins were not content with passive resistance; the dreaded daggers of the Fedavies were called into action; and against them it was found that power gave no security and caution no protection. In the very centre of the court of Bagdad, the Emir, Ahmed BáI, while with a crowd of nobles he was offering homage to his sovereign, fell beneath the daggers of three Assassins; these wretches were slain on the spot, but not before they had proclaimed to whose vengeance the Emir was a victim. The governor of Aleppo, the Grand Vizier, the son of Nezam-al-Molc, and the great uncle of the reigning Sultan, perished similarly; and when the Sultan Sanjár prepared to revenge these atrocious murders, he received an emphatic hint to remain quiet, for a dagger was planted during the night in his very pillow, with an inscription that the next time he offended it should find a sheath in his bosom. The terrified monarch instantly concluded a treaty of peace with the Grand Master.

Hassan Sabah ruled the Order for thirty-five years, during all which time he had but once quitted his Castle of Alamoot. Shut up there, he directed all the motions of his Fedavies, and with a dash of his pen regulated the fate of nobles and princes. He died tranquilly, bequeathing the dignity of Grand Master to the DaI, Kia-Buzurgomid; thus showing that his regard for the interests of his order was more powerful than even paternal affection.

The reign of the second Grand Master was even more sanguinary than that of the first. The vast treasures that had been gradually accumulated in the mountain-castles were liberally distributed to the relations of those Fedavies that were slain, and consequently those devotees went to execute their work of murder with the hope of eternal felicity for themselves, and the certainty of a rich provision for their relatives. We may judge from the following anecdote, of the extent that Ismaelian fanaticism was carried. Eight Fedavies attacked and murdered Búrshí, prince of Mosúl, in the public mosque; seven of them were slain, the eighth was left for dead, and intelligence of his death sent to Alamoot. When his mother heard the news, she adorned herself with robes of joy; but when she heard of his escape, she clothed

herself in sackcloth, and was inconsolable, because he had lost the glory of martyrdom. All the princes of Islám were now banded against the Order; but never was it more formidable than in this hour of danger. It would be impossible, within our limits, to mention even the names of the many illustrious victims that fell beneath the daggers of the Fedavies; the list includes two Khaliphs, several viziers, and a multitude of emirs and doctors of the law.

Buzurgomid died after a sanguinary reign of fourteen years, and was succeeded by his son, Mohammed. From this time forward the Grand Mastership became a hereditary dignity. The reign of the third Grand Master began, as that of the second ended, with the assassination of a khaliph. Raschid was murdered in his tent by four Ismaelians, who had for the purpose entered into his service as domestics; and the successful treachery was celebrated at Alamoot by a splendid series of rejoicings that lasted seven days and nights. "Arguments so sharp as daggers," says Mirkhoud, "were well calculated to reduce the enemies of the Ismaelians to silence." Kia Mohammed, however, did not possess the abilities of his father, and nearly fell a victim to a conspiracy planned by his son, Hassan. The treason was detected, but Hassan escaped punishment by the sacrifice of his associates. During this reign the Fatemite dynasty in Egypt was overthrown by the celebrated Nouredin. His nephew and successor, Salah-eddin, or, as he is more more commonly called, Saladin, subsequently inherited the power formerly enjoyed by the Egyptian Khaliphs, and became the most formidable antagonist whom the Assassins had yet encountered.

Hassan II. began his reign by publishing the secret doctrines of the Ismaelians, especially the indifference of human actions; and read publicly a letter, which he said had been addressed to him by the invisible Imám. He circulated a report that he was illegitimately descended from the Khaliphs of Egypt, and consequently, through them, from Ali, to whose family the empire of the world was destined. Over the library of Alamoot he placed the following inscription:—

WITH THE AID OF GOD,
THE EMPEROR OF THE UNIVERSE
HAS BROKEN, FOR HIS FOLLOWERS, THE FETTERS OF THE LAW,
GLORY BE UNTO HIS NAME!

A portion of the Ismaelians long continued to support the pretensions of Hassan, and never pronounced his name without a benediction; but their extravagance gave mortal offence to others, and he was murdered by his brother-in-law in the fourth year of his reign.

Mohammed II., the son and successor of Hassan, began his reign by severely avenging the murder of his father. He was learned himself, and the encourager of learning in others; but unfortunately he preached, even more emphatically than Hassan, the freedom of the illuminated from all religious and moral obli-

gation. The Syrian branch of the Ismaelians were now fast rising into consequence, and the Grand Prior at Mazyad was little inferior in power to the Grand Master at Alamoot. This was the age of speculative theology, both in Asia and Europe, when mysteries beyond human ken were discussed with a dogmatism, and decided with a flippancy that would have been ludicrous, had not their effects been disastrous. In the East, however, discussion was far more dangerous than in the West; for not only were the heterodox teachers delivered to the executioner, but the orthodox fell by the daggers of the Assassins.

Fakr-eddin Rhási was a celebrated orthodox teacher at Rey; his lectures as regularly ended with a curse on the Ismaelians as the speeches of the elder Cato with "*Delenda est Carthago*." A Fedavi was sent to teach him better manners, and this emissary, entering himself as a pupil, soon acquired, by his diligence and abilities, the confidence of his master. One day when Rhási was alone in his chamber, the Fedavi entered suddenly, seized him by the throat, threw him on the ground, and placed a dagger against his breast. "What do you mean?" cried the astonished doctor. "To tear out your heart and vitals." "Why?" "Because you have pronounced curses on the Ismaelians." Fakr-eddin bound himself by the most solemn oaths never to repeat the offence. The Assassin then permitting him to rise, told him that the Grand Master desired his friendship rather than his death, and had sent him a present of two rich robes and three hundred pieces of gold, which gift would be annually repeated. Thenceforward Fakr-eddin omitted the customary form of execration, and when asked the reason, replied, "Pointed arguments and weighty reasons have convinced me that we should not curse the Ismaelians."

Sinan, the Syrian, Grand Prior of the Assassins, possessed more firmness and perhaps more talents than any member of the Order since the time of Hassan-ebn-Salah; he lent his faithful Fedavies to his allies at a stipulated price, and these devotees were ready to be sold at the will of their ruler. Purchased by princes who envied Saladin, several of Sinan's emissaries attempted the life of that gallant prince; they were defeated; but Saladin, alarmed by a repetition of narrow escapes, hastened to conclude a treaty of peace with the Grand Prior. It was Sinan who sent the embassy to Almeric, King of Jerusalem, offering to submit to baptism, provided that the tribute should be remitted; for during the whole of his administration he seems to have acted independently of the Grand Master. This is a matter of some importance in the history of the interval between the first and third Crusade; for both William of Tyre and James of Acce use the name, "Old Man of the Mountain," sometimes for the Grand Master at Alamoot, and sometimes for the Grand Prior at Mazyad. Every person conversant with the history of the Crusades knows that these ambassadors were plundered and murdered by some errant Templars, whom their Grand Master refused to give

up for trial, and that in consequence, the leaders of the third crusade lost the advantages which they might have gained from the zealous co-operation of the Ismaelians.

In the third Crusade, Conrad, Marquis of Montserrat and Tyre, was murdered by two Assassins; most cotemporary writers, and most continental historians, accuse Richard I. of having instigated this crime; but it is stoutly denied by those who are pleased to regard that monarch as the hero of England. The defence made by Richard's partizans in his own days first merits our attention; a letter was produced, from the Sheikh-al-Jebal to the Duke of Austria, acquitting Richard, and declaring that Conrad had been slain for having perfidiously murdered some Ismaelian merchants. That letter was beyond all doubt a forgery; it is dated by the era of the Seleucides, though the Ismaelians at this time used the epoch of Hassan II.; though professing to be written at Mazyad, the residence of the Grand Prior, it bears the signature of the Grand Master; the writer is made to swear by the law, at a moment when it was the boast of the Ismaelians that for them the law was abrogated; finally, the prince of the Assassins is made to protest that his Fedavies were never sent but to avenge direct insults to the Order, a circumstance notoriously untrue.

Let us now see what the cotemporary Oriental writers say on the subject, for their testimony must be regarded as impartial. Ebn-Alatir says, that when Ascalon was destroyed by Saladin, Conrad, who had previously quarrelled with Richard, wrote him a letter to the following effect: "God keep us from having such a man as you to command us! Madman that you are, you knew that Saladin was destroying Ascalon, and did not fly to its defence; you did not sieze this opportunity to enter the town, without encountering any resistance. Does not Saladin's sacrifice of Ascalon prove that he was not in a state to defend it? I swear if I had been in your place, we should now be masters of Ascalon, and not a tower of it should have been destroyed." The same historian informs us, that the Marquis sent ambassadors to conclude a secret treaty with Saladin. Bohn-eddin, who had personal knowledge of the circumstances, declares that Conrad offered, if put in possession of Sidon and Berytus, to join Saladin in expelling Richard and the Christian princes; and that when Conrad asked for immediate possession of the cities, the Sultan required the Marquis first to recover Acre for him, and restore the Mussulman captives to liberty. He adds, that it was the discovery of these negotiations which made Richard so readily conclude peace with Saladin. Soon after this, Conrad was assassinated; his murderers were put to the torture, and, it is generally agreed, declared that they were instigated by Richard. After all, it is difficult to pronounce a decisive opinion on the King's guilt or innocence, any more than to tell whether the Arabian assassin, detected A.D. 1158, in the camp of the Emperor Barbarossa, was employed by "the Old Man of the Mountains," or "the Old Man of the Seven Hills"—was a partizan of the pon-

tiff of Bagdad, or the pontiff of Rome; he who adopts either theory, may support his views by plausible arguments and very respectable authority.

Two years after the death of Conrad, Henry, Count of Champagne was invited to visit Mazyad by the Grand Prior, who had succeeded Sinan. After having visited several strong forts, he was led into a court, near which stood a very lofty tower, on each of whose battlements were two sentinels clothed in white, a proof that they had been initiated into the secret doctrines. "Doubtless," said the Grand Prior, "your servants are not so devoted as mine;" at the same time he made a signal with his hand, and two of the sentinels springing from the tower, dashed themselves to pieces. "If you wish, the rest shall do the same," said the Prior; the Count, however, had no desire to witness the exhibition. When Henry was departing, the Grand Prior offered him the use of his Fedavies to remove any of his enemies, a favour which the Count declined. Hassan-ebn-Sabah, the founder of the Order, had long before given similar proofs of his power to the ambassador of Melek Sháh; when the envoy spoke of the overwhelming power of the Sultan, he commanded two of his attendants to stab themselves, and they instantly plunged their daggers into their bosoms. "Ask your Sultan," said Hassan, with a gloomy smile, "whether he could obtain such implicit obedience?"

Mohammed II. was poisoned by his son Jalal-eddin Hassan, who took the Grand Mastership as the reward of his guilt.

Hassan III. departed essentially from the policy of his predecessors; he laboured zealously to restore the pure faith of Islám; prohibited the doctrines preached by his father and grandfather; rebuilt the mosques; caused public worship to be regularly celebrated; and invited to his court the most celebrated professors of the orthodox theology. The sincerity of the new Mussulman seeming very doubtful to the inhabitants of Casbin, he invited some of the most distinguished citizens to Alamoot, and in their presence committed the heretical works of Hassan-ebn-Sabah to the flames. Soon afterwards he sent his mother and wife, with a splendid train, to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca. But this reformation seems to have been nothing more than an act of profound hypocrisy; for we know, beyond all shadow of a doubt, that the pernicious doctrines of the Ismaelians were still taught in secret, and that copies of all the works of Hassan-ebn-Sabah were found in the library of Alamoot, when the fortress was subdued by the Mongolians. A secret order in Europe has frequently imitated the policy of the Assassins, and veiled pernicious doctrines with profound hypocrisy; before the restoration of the Jesuits, half the journals of Europe were in the habit of praising the liberality of this body, and the decided approximation of the Romish to the Evangelical Churches which would result from their restoration. They were restored; but scarcely had their influence been re-established in the Vatican, when a Bull appeared

against Bible Societies, written in that language adopted by the Boar of Ardennes when he wrote "*si non payatis burlabo monasterium vestrum*," and proving, as Heeren felicitously expresses it, that "Jesuit maxims and Jesuit Latin are equally incorrigible."

Hassan III. after a tranquil reign, was poisoned by some of his relations; he was succeeded by his grandson, a mere boy, who was, however, like the Lama of Tibet, supposed to become inspired from the moment of his accession. The young Mohammed III. abolished all the reformatations affected by his predecessor, and restored the Ismaelian doctrines; and assassinations again became frequent in the East; but the capricious tyranny of Mohammed, as his age advanced, became intolerable, and he was at length murdered by his own son, Rokneddin.

Rokneddin was the last Grand Master. The centre and East of Asia had been trampled down by the vast Mongolian hordes that obeyed the commands of the dreadful Jenghiz-Khan: his third successor, Mangú-Khan, determined to turn his efforts Westwards, and the march of his forces was accelerated by frequent embassies from the feeble Khaliphs of Bagdad, entreating his protection against the formidable power of the Assassins. Mangú entrusted the command of his forces to his brother, Húlakú-Khan, who, in the 654th year of the Hegira, A.D. 1256, entered the territories of Alamoot with his unconquered hordes. Misled by the perfidious advice of his Vizier, Rokneddin surrendered himself to the Mongolian chief, while he secretly urged his officers to defend their castles to the utmost. The treachery was discovered, he was instantly put to death, and orders were issued for the utter extermination of the Ismaelians. Alamoot surrendered three days after it was summoned; its immense library, and its splendid collection of philosophical apparatus were totally destroyed, but not before they had been examined by the celebrated Vizier, and still more celebrated historian, Allah-eddid-Atamelik-Juainy, whose summary of the annals of this sect has been closely copied by Mirkhoud. The Grand Prior of Syria still refused submission; but Húlakú was diverted from immediately punishing him by a more important enterprise—the subversion of the Khaliphate, and the conquest of Bagdad. This event, ranking in importance with the destruction of Rome by the Goths, or the capture of Constantinople, must not be discussed incidentally; perhaps at some future period we may direct attention to this interesting portion of Oriental History.

Bebars, Sultan of Egypt, had the honour of finally destroying the power of the Ismaelians in Syria; but though he razed all their castles to the earth, he had to sustain a long and furious guerilla warfare, more harassing and more destructive than a regular campaign. Hamza, one of the Ismaelian leaders, like Robin Hood in England, or the Cid Campeador in Spain, is the hero of a thousand popular songs in Syria, celebrating his romantic exploits, and his dauntless resistance to the invaders.

There are still a few Ismaelians scattered through Syria, Irak, and Persia, but their creeds are now mere forms of words, which they cannot themselves interpret, and their ceremonies are an unmeaning ritual. We shall not, like Von Hammer, enter into any comparison between the Assassins and the secret societies of Europe; such an investigation would be consistent neither with our design nor our limits. But we cannot conclude this long article without noticing that the most important contribution made to Oriental literature since the first appearance of the *History of the Assassins*, is the work of an Irishman, and a member of the Dublin University. The translation of the first part of Mirkhoud, by Mr. David Shea, Professor of Oriental Languages at Heyleyburg, once a Scholar of Trinity College, Dublin, is, by the unanimous voice of all the Orientalists throughout Europe, declared to be the most perfect translation ever made from the Persian into a Western language. That he will be encouraged to complete the work, we sincerely hope; because Mirkhoud is far the best historian of the East; his work is, in fact, a perfect unfolding of human nature, as it exists in Asia, and deserves to be studied by all who regard history as one of the most certain developments of the science of mind. "He who would become acquainted with mental philosophy," says Victor Cousin, "must diligently study history; for the mind makes itself most manifest in action; and he must begin with the East, for thence came both natural and philosophical light."

W. C. T.

FANATICISM.*

We do not think the author of this, and some preceding works, a popular writer, or one likely to become so. Our readers who remember the pompous announcement of the issue of each thousand copies of his "Enthusiasm," or his "Saturday Evening," from the press, calling upon the expectant purchaser to beware lest he might be too late to become possessor of a copy—our readers who remember all this, may wonder at our assertion, yet we have made it advisedly. We do not think this author popular, nor likely to become so. True, he is purchased, and he is probably read; but many hundreds buy who never read him through, and many more hundreds read who neither relish nor understand him. We think his style a decided impediment to his popularity; it is heavy, cumbrous, and abstract—as formal as if the author was writing diplomatic papers, and yet occasionally variegated with the most common-place similes and figures that we have met with out of the conclusions of a schoolboy's theme, or the modest prefatory appeal of juvenile poems. It labours under an unnatural tumour of expression, which must displease persons of good taste, and which conceals the thoughts it would express from persons of bad or no taste, so as not to be in favour with either. Do we deny that there are passages of decided, and elevated, and exciting eloquence in all this anonymous writer's volumes? Assuredly not; and if he only understood a little the art of shading, and did not constantly desire to be fine, we know no writer more likely to establish a character for good writing as well as deep thinking;—and this brings us to our second objection to his popularity. We think that his thoughts and train of reasoning are not only too obscurely expressed to please *the million*, but that they are in themselves too recondite—are generally drawn from too deep a source, and aim at too noble an object, to please universally. We do not mean to say that he does not sometimes mistake the original for the true, or fancy that which he expresses oddly must be novel and just; but we do not hesitate to say, that we scarcely know an author of the present day who has taken a more just, a more original, or a more philosophical view of society and its diseases, tempered with a spirit of deep and scriptural piety, and accompanied by a power of reasoning and command of expressions of no common grasp. If his unlimited command of language were under the controul of a better taste, and his deep and philosophic views corrected occasionally by a little of the practical experience which a minister of the Gospel, and seldom any but a minister of the Gospel, possesses, though we think him too

* Fanaticism. By the Author of "Natural History of Enthusiasm." London: Holdsworth and Ball. 1833.

good and too powerful a writer ever to be popular in this novel-reading and review-studying age, we would not wish a fairer claim to the approbation of posterity than that possessed by the author of the "Saturday Evening."

We have called this author by the name of his second, rather than of his first and more popular work, and we have done so because we think it a superior work, and more likely, notwithstanding all its heterodoxy of taste and low-churchmanship, to carry its author down to posterity. The "Natural History of Enthusiasm" was a novel work; it took the public by surprise; its peculiarity of style and apparent and real power of reasoning carried all who understood, as well as all who pretended to understand reasoning; but before the second work appeared, the one became frightened and the other became fatigued, and we do not think it had a fair chance. Certain it is that it has been more talked of than read—more praised than examined; and yet we sincerely think that for all the qualities which confer value on this anonymous writer's works, it is far superior to its predecessor—we will add, superior in many of the very points in which the writer would most value himself. It is impossible to read "Enthusiasm" a second time without perceiving that the writer is himself a little carried away by the very feeling he would discard and condemn; that he is so anxious to trace his subject passion in every thing, that he exercises more skill in combining than in discriminating; and for fear of missing enthusiasm where it does exist, that he fancies its being where it does not. This leads him to the undue depreciation of things, and feelings, and habits, not only harmless, but practically beneficial, and often leads him to the brink of that gulf which he would most abhor, formality and coldness of religion. Now we remember nothing of this kind in the second volume; he has much in it that we doubt; much from which, as sturdy churchmen, we dissent; some occasional inconsistencies, and much tumid writing; but his religion is pure, is elevating, is of the heart, and all his speculations are of an ennobling character. Whether contemplating the union which the Gospel tendencies must establish, when fully developed, or deducing from, and joining with faith, the charities of life, or soaring to the possibilities of the state that intervenes between death and the resurrection, his theories, his feelings, his reasonings, are interesting and ennobling; and one turns with a spirit refreshed by the contrast from the cold and gelid speculations which would render man, while a pilgrim, the slave of self and his wants, or rob him with a semi-sceptical spirit of the joy of believers, that when "absent from the body, he will be present with the Lord."

The work we are now proceeding to consider is, in fact, but a part of a series, of which the "Natural History of Enthusiasm" was the commencement.

"More than twelve years ago the author projected a work which should, at one view, exhibit the several principal forms of spurious or corrupted

religion. But discouraged by the magnitude and difficulty of such a task, he, after a while, yet not without much reluctance, abandoned the undertaking. Nevertheless, the subject continually pressed upon his mind. At length he selected a single portion of the general theme, and adventured—"Natural History of Enthusiasm."

He was deterred from pursuing his task for some time—

"Fearing lest, by an unskilful or unadvised treatment of certain arduous matters which it involves, he might create embarrassment where most he desired to do good, he laid aside his materials."

But again yielding to his desire, he reassumed the subject of Fanaticism, and produced the present volume. We are glad to see that the same medium of information, the preface, informs us that this will not be the last volume we may promise ourselves, dependent only on the health and life of the author.

"He next proposes, in advancing towards the completion of his original design, to take in hand Superstition, and its attendant Credulity.

"A natural transition leads from Superstition and Credulity to Spiritual Despotism. The principal perversions of Religion having thus been reviewed, it would be proper to describe that Corruption of Morals, which, in different modes, has resulted from the overthrow of genuine piety. There would then only remain to be considered Scepticism, or Philosophic Irreligion; and the series will embrace all that the author deems indispensable to the undertaking he has so long meditated."

An undertaking of deep and serious importance; no less than to give an history of the moral diseases which infect religion to the very core, and springing from the corruptions of human nature, are borne on the wings of society through every situation of mortal man. We do not pretend to say how our author will connect one part with another, or join the other evils with the *origi mali* enthusiasm; but we think he has been successful in his connexion between the two first links of his chain. Enthusiasm is derived from the undue mixture of the imagination with religion; and Fanaticism, from the malignant passions being added to the compound. We shall have some opportunities for considering the accuracy of confining or extending the term to this description, and now merely wish to give the author's own view of the subject.

The three first chapters are introductory to the general design. After urging the necessity for mildness and kindness in the mode of treating religious diseases, and asking with considerable force—

"Why the religious passions might not claim from supercilious wits a measure of that lenity (if not indulgence) which is readily afforded to vices of another sort.—If pride, abhorrent as it is, and if ambition, with both hands dyed in blood, and if the lust of wealth, making the weak its prey, and if sensual desires, devoid of pity, are all to be gently handled, and all

in turn find patrons among sages—why might not also Fanaticism? why might not Enthusiasm? why not Superstition?"

He urges the importance of instituting, in such a spirit, an inquiry into moral nosology, from the circumstances of the times, from the spirit of active exertion abroad; and therefore the danger of impeding usefulness by sending abroad unarmed principle to meet the moral evils of society; and finally, from the very possibility of a renewal of some of those awful delusions which once turned the world upside down, hurried millions into their vortex, and bathed continents in blood.—

"Disbelief is the ephemeron of our times; but disbelief, far from being natural to man, can never be more than a reaction that comes on, as a faintness, after a season of credulity and superstition. And how soon may a revulsion take place! How soon, after the hour of exhaustion has gone by, may the pleasurable excitements of high belief and of unbounded confidence be eagerly courted!—courted by the vulgar in compliance with its relish of whatever is pungent and intense; courted by the noble as a means, or as a pretext of power; courted by the frivolous as a relief from lassitude; and by the profound and thoughtful, as the proper elements of minds of that order!

"Whenever the turn of belief shall come round (we are not here speaking of a genuine religious faith) empassioned sentiments, of all kinds, will follow without delay. The connexion of credulity with virulence is deep seated in the principles of human nature, and it should not be deemed impertinent or unseasonable at any time to attempt to trace to its origin this order of sentiments, or to lay bare the fibres of its strength: unless indeed, we will profess to think that man is no more what once he was."

Having defined fanaticism in the manner we have mentioned, and pointed out the rush of the malignant passions, which, springing from a part of our constitution decidedly calculated for good, become evil.—

"Either by excess and too great intensity—or by perversion, or misdirection from their proper object—or by prolongation from momentary impulses to habits and permanent qualities, as well the animal qualities as the irascible passions assume a pernicious form, and derange the harmony of nature."

Up to this point even the irascible passions, though they contain the seeds of the malignant, and in their native state are merely defensible, contain not a little that is beneficial; but when they go beyond this, their utility ends, they become part of the moral system—become *dispositions and habits*, and degrade the moral being. The most remarkable change in their quality is that of their becoming pleasurable: *οδὲ ἀρετὴ ποιεῖν, παρὰ πρὸς ἀπολαύμενον* is assuredly a moral truth, but so low is the mind capable of being reduced, that even these become the sources of pleasure. The atmosphere of irascible existence in which the individual lives is necessarily commingled with self-love, and this, with the former and malignant principle colours every thing, and every

object, so as to justify to the distempered imagination this very emotion; while the actual and beneficial feeling of retributive justice, which is part of our moral constitution, is thus perverted, and forced to bear testimony in our own favour; and thus, to vindicate the very excesses of passion, which, if it enjoyed a more healthful constitution, it would condemn with abhorrence. Our limits will not permit us to dwell upon this subject, which, in connection with the alliance between imagination and the malignant passions, and the splendour shed around the latter by their alliance with the former, is discussed with ingenuity and acuteness. Our author assumes—

“That where neither reason, nor the genuine affections, but imagination, acts as the prime impulse in religion, the malign emotions are found in close attendance, and seldom fail to convert spurious piety into an energetic rancour.”

And of the elements of this rancour which refers into fanaticism, the principal are :—

“1st. A deference to malignant invisible power: 2d. The natural consequence of such a deference—rancorous contempt or detestation of the mass of mankind, as religiously cursed and abominable; and 3d. The belief of corrupt favouritism on the part of invisible powers, towards a sect or particular class of men; and this partiality is the antithesis of the relentless tyranny of which all other men are the objects.”

And corresponding with the variety of combination these admit, we have fanaticism considered as that of the scourge, or personal infliction; the brand, or immolation and cruelty; the banner, or ambition and conquest, and the symbol, or creeds, dogmatism and ecclesiastical violence. Those our author considers at length, and with great variety of illustration and example: we can but give a very few of his leading opinions, and illustrate them by a very few quotations.

Ascetic fanaticism, he thinks, springs either from the internal and unperverted action of the malignant passions, which insulate the individual from his species; from the haughtiness that refuses to draw comfort or happiness from those around him; from the presence of religion operating on a mild and meditative intellect, or upon excessive and ill-governed sensibility, or from some of those mixed motives of superstition, misanthropy, or enthusiasm which mock all attempt at analysis. But the elements on which these nurturing principles act, are, he thinks, these :—

“There are three distinct elements upon which fanatical sentiment, when incontroverted, always employs itself; and, in each instance the product is very distinguishable. These are, 1st. The miseries, physical and mental, to which man is liable. 2d. A consciousness of personal guilt, and dread of retribution. And, 3d. The supposition of supererogatory or vicarious merit.”

The first of these assuredly acts upon some high-wrought and haughty minds; the second is the common source of ascetic and self-inflicted cruelty, equally in the East and West, but one, as he justly remarks, which in its worst and most appalling form, still presents a most striking argument in favour equally of the existence of a moral power in the mind, and of its superiority to the animal principles of our nature.

"The liability of man to go so far astray, springs from those ulterior principles that are involved in his nature, and which bespeak an immortal destiny. Every such practical absurdity is an implicit proof of the presence of a latent capacity for entertaining the highest truths; and if man be the only fool among the tribes of earth, and the only wretch, it is because he alone might be wise, virtuous and happy.

"And again, the relation of man to invisible and retributive power is, by the same means, established; the secret of every sort of self-infliction is a tacit compromise with future justice; and when notions such as these take effect in a paramount manner, carrying all other reasons before them, we have evidence that, in the order of nature, religion is the sovereign motive."

Nor is it less striking that, by an internal process, this conducts to religious imposture and delusion. Fear first prompts the votary, whether entering upon a state of compromise with the object of his worship, and seeking to strike a balance with justice, either by voluntarily anticipating punishment, or by the excess of his endurance proving it to be unjust; thus he adds torment to torment, until pain ceases to become terrible, the functions that minister to agony rest, and the torpor equally of the nerve and of the mind leaves room for other feelings to penetrate. Vanity and ambition find their habitation in his heart who regards himself, and is regarded by others, as a hero; and he who began by a sincere though fanatical enthusiasm, ends by deliberate imposture. To this feverish elevation, nothing has contributed more than the third element, namely, the doctrine of supererogation. He who, at the bar of retributive and distributive justice, could stand as the representative and atonement for others, and exhibit his sackcloth, his iron girdle, his bed of spikes, as satisfying for their sins, must rest in all the assurance of self-salvation that his liberality to others could confer, while it gives him a power over their consciences that nothing but guilt and ignorance can estimate. But we must go farther, and from self-inflicted torments to the infliction of torments upon others, is but a narrow pass, easily and rapidly surmounted. The honest, but fanatical ascetic soon becomes the merciless, though perhaps equally honest persecutor, and the rack and the brand, which he had tried upon himself, he prepares without remorse for others:—

"The derivation of fanatical cruelty from fanatical austerity is by no means difficult to trace: nor is the line of descent far extended. Often

indeed has the one generated the other in the same bosom; or if the history of the Church is looked to, it will be seen that, within the circuit of a century, or more, those outrages upon human nature which had been going on in the cells of the monastery, and those preposterous sentiments which the ascetic life enkindled, reached their proper consummation when the friar and the inquisitor took in hand to rid the Church of her enemies."

What a tremendous legacy to posterity was left the fathers of the Christian Church, who, in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, by their eulogiums, raised to an undue elevation the virtues of the ascetic; and by their examples and their rules first assisted in opening a fountain, whence the turbid and bloodstained waters of personal infiction, of pride and intolerance, of persecution and cruelty, have long flowed. Our readers will thank us for the following quotations:

"Forgetting, then, the frenzied anchorets of the Egyptian deserts, of the rocks of Sinai, and of the solitudes of Syria, and leaving unnamed the savage heroes of the Romish calendar, let us take an instance, in which a due admiration of great qualities must mingle with our reprobation of mischievous sentiments. Instead of a St. Symeon, or a St. Columban, we turn to Basil—the primate of Cappadocia.

"It may be too much to affirm that Basil, eminent as were his qualities, or indeed that any single mind could have turned the tide which, at the opening of the fourth century, was in full course, bearing the Christian world—eastern and western, fast toward that swamp of superstition wherein all its virtues were soon after lost. Yet it is certain that although he might not have had power to divert the course of things, his influence was great and extensive in accelerating the unhappy movement. As well in the Latin as the Greek Church, and during many successive centuries the writings of Basil formed the text book of mockery, and gave sanction to its follies.

"Far from seeming fanatical or malignant, the monastic system, as it stands on the shining pages of Basil, bears quite a seductive form. His descriptions of his own seclusion among the mountains of Pontus, and of the pleasures of abstracted meditation and holy exercise, can hardly be read without kindling an enthusiasm of the same order.

"Nor perhaps, apart from the aid of that comment which the after history of the Church has made upon those principles, would it have been easy to demonstrate their pernicious tendency: and yet there is little or nothing among the enormities of the ascetic life which might not be justified on the grounds assumed by Basil:—as for example, That the domestic constitution of man is abstractedly imperfect, and irreconcilable with high attainments in piety.—That religion—or at least that the only admirable order of religion, consists—not in the worthy and fruitful exercise of virtuous principles amid the occasions and trials of common life; but in cutting off all opportunities of exercise, and in retreating from every trial of constancy:—That, in a word, piety is a something which, in every

sense, is foreign to the present state, and can flourish only in proportion as its laws and constitutions are condemned and discarded.

"The first practical measure necessary for giving effect to maxims such as these, was of course that of breaking up the conjugal economy, and of gathering men and women (destined by God for each other, as sharers in the joys of life, and helpers in its labours and sorrows,) into horrid fraternities and comfortless sisterhoods of virginity. This violence once done to nature—and then every lesser enormity was only a proper consequence, and a consistent part of the monstrous invention. All fanaticism, all cruelties, all impurities were in embryo within this egg. Strange does it seem, or strange to us of this age that the authors and promoters of the unnatural usage, while reading the evangelic records, did not see that the virtue of our Lord and of his Apostles, if we are not to think it quite inferior to that of which the monks made their boast, was altogether unlike it, and must have been founded on different maxims. Of our Lord it is said that he was continually accompanied in his journeys by women who "ministered unto him." But the doctors of monkery assure us that the society of women is altogether pernicious, and wholly incompatible with advancement in the Christian life; yes, that the mere touch of a female hand is mortal to sanctity!"

"Nevertheless the germs of malignant religionism (such as in a preceding section we have briefly stated them to be) are not wanting even in Basil. It is evident, for example, that the very serious impressions he entertained of the Divine Justice, and its bearing upon man, were not balanced, as in the minds of the apostles, by a clear and auspicious understanding of the great article of justification by faith:—his faith, therefore, was comfortless, severe, and dim. Again, the scriptural belief of the agency and malice of infernal spirits, had become, in that age, and before it, so turgid and extravagant that it filled a far larger space on the circle of vision than properly belongs to it.

"Furthermore, the broad distinction made between what was insolently termed "the common life," and the "angelic," or monastic, and upon which Basil so much insists, could not fail to generate, as in fact it did, a supercilious disdain of the mass, not of mankind at large merely, but of the Christian community, and with it, a preposterous conceit (ill concealed beneath the cant of humility) of peculiar privilege and celestial dignity, as the distinction of a few. Thus was it that all the stones of the foundation of the pandemonium of pride, impurity, and cruelty, were laid by the hands of men whom we must venerate and admire."

(To be continued.)

* We turn for a moment from Basil, who, nevertheless, is strong on this point. "So far as possible," says Isidore, "all converse with women is to be shunned: or if this cannot altogether be avoided, they should be spoken with only, the eye fixed on the earth. . . . In the case of almost all who have fallen by their means, *death hath entered in by the windows!*"

REV. T. KELLY'S REPLY TO R. D.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

DEAR SIR—The letter signed R. D. in your February Number, containing strictures on my answer to my friend Mr. William Burgh, should be read by any one who wishes to see how a controversial letter should be written. If the present case were a trial of intellectual strength, I should not wish to come into collision with R. D.; but our business is, surely, one of another kind; we are engaged in the investigation of truth in its connection with an important branch of Christian duty; and our object, I trust, is, not the establishment of our own opinions, but the discovery of what is the mind of the Spirit on the subject in controversy between us.

My friend, R. D. (I feel much pleasure in being allowed thus to designate the author of the letter that I am now answering) commences the *polemical* part of his letter thus: "I would begin with his definition of a church, in which, I think, will be found the very essence and germ of all that I consider erroneous in his system of church government." R. D. will allow me to correct him here. The passage in question is not my definition of a church; it is only the assertion of one of its properties; *that*, namely, of being composed of a number of persons, "who either did or might assemble in the same place." My attempt to *define* a church is found in the 12th page, and is as follows: "The church of Christ at Ephesus, for example, was a community in that city, consisting of those who professed to be the disciples of Christ, who recognised one another in that capacity, and who gave to one another *scriptural* evidence of being what they professed to be." With respect to the asserted property of *coming together in one place*, I believe I am quite correct in saying, that it belongs to such a community as is denoted by the Greek word *ἐκκλησία*, whether its bond of union be of a civil or a religious nature; nor do I think that my friend R. D. can furnish an instance in which the term is *unequivocally* used, either in the classical or sacred writings, without reference to this property. The cases produced by R. D. do not, I think, make this assertion questionable. The church at Jerusalem, whatever its numbers were, did assemble, it appears, in one place. James says to Paul, "The multitude, *πλῆθος*, must needs come together, for they will hear that thou art come." Acts xxi. 22. And as to the church at Ephesus, there is not, I think, the least reason to suppose that it consisted of such numbers as to create any difficulty about their assembling in the same place. In the interval between the period referred to, Acts, xix. 7, when "all the men were about twelve," and that to which R. D. refers, Acts xx., it is not probable that such an increase of numbers occurred as that the church could not meet together in one place. With respect to

those passages quoted by R. D. which relate to the whole body of God's elect, I do not see what difficulty they can create, inasmuch as this body is *an assembly* in its own nature; and will, as soon as it becomes practicable, be literally brought together in the same place, when Christ will present it to himself "a glorious assembly, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing."

When my friend R. D. says that I quoted Eph. iii. 10, *partially*, he only means, I believe, that I quoted *part* of the passage. Certainly this is true; but my friend may assure himself I had no fear of the emphatic *now*, as if it affected my view of the subject. I am quite ready to admit that when the apostle wrote, "the manifold wisdom of God" *was* made known *by* the church "to principalities and powers;" but R. D. will, I am sure, acknowledge that if *now*, when the apostle wrote, *was* emphatical, it could only be so in relation to *the past*; and that when compared with the wondrous exhibition of the church, when *all* its members shall be assembled, the object actually presented to view in the day when Paul wrote "has no glory, by reason of the glory that excelleth." As to supposing that the church was to become the *possessor* of the knowledge in question, and not the *occasion* of its being possessed by others, this never could for a moment be in my mind; the passage is too explicit to admit of my falling into such a mistake.

But though I think it quite clear that the word *ἐκκλησία* does denote a body that assembles either periodically, or occasionally, or eventually, in the same place, my friend R. D. mistakes, if he thinks that I build any important conclusion upon the mere fact that this is the proper use of the word. If the apostle had written "To the church in Galatia," or "in Asia," instead of "the churches," my friend R. D. does not, I am sure, suppose that I should have acknowledged that he had in his contemplation *the people* of Galatia or of Asia. The inference I should have drawn would have been simply that the word *ἐκκλησία* admitted of such a use of it as the apostle made, when he meant to denote a number of separate assemblies of Christians who belonged to those regions. And if my friend R. D. was to call the aggregate of the *Christian* congregations in Ireland, "*the church*" of Christ in Ireland, instead of, what I should call them, "*the churches*," I should not quarrel with him on that account. The real difference between us is not about the proper use of a term; but about the nature of the thing to which we apply that term.

The next objection of my friend R. D. is to my ascribing to a church the reception of members. "As far," he says, "as I know the Scriptures, there is not to be found an example of a church, that is, the individual members composing a congregation, sitting in judgment, as to receiving or rejecting an individual who was desirous of worshipping Christ with them." p. 112. My friend R. D. has, however, himself referred to a case bearing *some* resemblance to the thing which I am pleading for, and which he objects to; it is the case of Saul, mentioned Acts ix., and is re-

lated thus: "When Saul was come to Jerusalem, he essayed to join himself to the disciples; but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple; but Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles—and he was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem." Such is the account of the matter given in the Acts. But this, says R. D. "was only the caution that any body of persons would have, with regard to an individual who had been their enemy, and who now professed to be their friend." Most certainly; but how does this affect the principle of the case? A man presents himself to the congregation as a brother; the congregation, in the unquestioned exercise of its discretion, demurs, in the first instance, to his admission, but, upon being better informed, withdraws its objection, and recognises his claim. Where is the *essential* difference between such a case and the following? An inhabitant of Dublin presents himself to a congregation acting upon the principles I am pleading for, and asks permission to join their communion. The simple fact to ascertain is, whether he is a disciple. To ascertain this, an inquiry is instituted, and by the result of the inquiry the congregation is determined either to receive or to reject him. The *cause* of hesitation is a mere circumstance in the case; the precedent is substantially, in my opinion, complete. But this is not all. Does not the apostle call upon the Corinthian church to *put away*—does he not blame them for not doing it; and when the excluded offender has repented, does he not call upon the same church to *restore him* to their communion? Are these acts different in quality from the act of receiving a member, or could any authority warrant exclusion or restoration, but the same that warrants admission? I should say, no. That R. D. should find any difficulty in the cases of the *jailor*, of *Lydia*, and of *Cornelius*, surprises me, seeing there existed no congregation, with respect to them, to whose judgment their pretensions could have been submitted. That whenever the question did arise, the church would act, *mutatis mutandis*, as they did in the case of Saul, no reasonable doubt, I think, can exist. But though I have endeavoured, and I hope not altogether unsuccessfully, to show that the Scripture *does* furnish authority for the proceeding in question, I do not feel disposed to retract the assertion in my former letter, namely, that a power of receiving and excluding "is involved in the very nature of the thing." In the case of every voluntary association, enrolment brings with it certain obligations according to the nature of its fellowship; and in the case of the Christian brotherhood, these obligations are of the most solemn and affecting character, as my friend R. D. well knows. If we acknowledge those obligations, we shall be careful how we take men's pretensions upon trust. Few ceremonies are, when conducted with any thing like due solemnity, more important and more affecting than the formal and public recognition of an individual as a brother in Christ, on the part of a Christian assembly.

The question of "visible distinction in worship," as not being essentially connected with the present question, I do not think it necessary to dwell upon here; but I would remind R. D. that the principle is recognized by his own church. Certain characters are, by her laws, forbidden to join in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Perhaps it is not quite so clear as my friend R. D. seems to suppose, that the application of the principle should be limited to one social ordinance, the rest being left open to promiscuous communion; so that, even on his own principles, R. D. may perceive that the question is not about "visible distinction in worship," but to what extent consistency requires the rule to be applied.

We come now to the letter of Paul to Titus, about the meaning of which, as it respects *diocesan episcopacy*, my friend R. D. and I entertain very different opinions. He thinks that he never met what appears to him "a greater instance of misinterpretation of Scripture," though unintentional, than that which I am chargeable with in the present instance; and I think, strange to tell, that I have given the true interpretation of this portion of Scripture. I said in my former letter, p. 62, "I conceive that the word *ordain*, in Titus i. 5, means no more than mere appointment to office, and that the apostle's directions were simply that Titus should see that the thing was done, and done in the usual way." My friend R. D. says, that Paul "sent him to exercise his judgment and authority in selecting proper persons to be elders, and ordaining them to the office." p. 114.

Before I proceed to the discussion of the question, I must ask my friend, how it is that he can, on the principles of the Established Church, take such a view of the subject as this? His Church identifies the appointment of deacons with what occurs in the 6th chapter of Acts; and the appointment of priests, with the functions intrusted to Titus and Timothy. If this be so, what was Titus sent to do but to confer orders of a higher grade upon men already in office? That is, to make the deacons priests. Now these deacons, according to the Established Church, recognizing, as it does, the identity of the office instituted at Jerusalem, and spoken of Acts vi., with that which her deacons hold, must have been already chosen, yes, and chosen absolutely and exclusively, by the people. "Wherefore, brethren, *look ye out among you* seven men of honest report." On his own principles, then, R. D. has no right, I think, to condemn me for bringing the Church in for some share in the performance of those functions which he would ascribe to Titus *alone*. But I waive any advantage to be derived from this consideration, and am content to argue the question on its own merits.

There are two points to which the objections of my friend R. D. refer: first, my assigning to *the Church* what R. D. supposes was assigned by Paul to Titus; and secondly, my denying

to the Established Church the benefit of the precedent afforded by the cases of Timothy and Titus, in favour of *diocesan Episcopacy*.

Let us consider these two points. In one thing, I take for granted my friend will agree with me, namely, that Titus was neither commanded nor authorized to deviate from the general practice of the Churches. The thing was to be done, as I said, "in the usual way." Now, if it is a matter of fact, attested by the Church historians of the primitive age, that elders *were* chosen by the suffrages of the people, we have a *prima facie* proof that Titus was not to choose the elders, but that *the people* were to do it. Whatever change the constitution of the Church underwent, it certainly was not on the side of democracy; and I am sure my friend R. D. is too well informed not to know, that the choice of their office-bearers continued in the churches until the degeneracy of those bodies made an alteration necessary. The Bishop of Rome himself was created by popular election till about the twelfth century—Innocent II., in the year 1130, being, I believe, the first Pope elected by the Cardinals, and an objection, on that very ground, being taken to the lawfulness of his title. It is, then, I suspect, my friend R. D. who is mistaken in attributing to Titus what belonged to the Church, rather than I, in taking any thing from Titus and giving it to the Church. Were I to assign to Titus the function of selection and appointment to office, instead of the Church, I should be interpreting the passage before us in direct contradiction to well ascertained fact. There seems to be a strange mistake as to the meaning of the Greek word which the Apostle employs in this place, I mean the word *καθιστημι*; it is supposed to answer to the English word *ordain*, in its *ecclesiastical* sense, but no opinion can be more unfounded: not a single instance can be produced in which the original word has this meaning. The word *ordain*, in its relation to the present subject, is used to denote a certain *religious ceremony*, in virtue of which a man becomes invested with a *clerical* character, and a consequent right to perform certain functions, belonging exclusively to persons invested with that character. Now, without touching the question about the nature of such a ceremony, I must beg leave to say, that the verb *καθιστημι* has nothing to do with the ceremony at all, except being introductory to it. By turning to Acts vi. we find the apostles calling upon the people to select from among themselves fit persons to perform certain services, which the Apostles could not attend to without deserting their own peculiar duties. Three things were to be done; selection, appointment, and formal recognition. The people were to do the first act; the whole assembly, apostles and brethren, were to do the second; and the apostles the last. The apostles said to the people, "Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business." The *we* here does not mean the apostles, but the whole assembly, including the twelve. If it did, there

would be no occasion for the pronoun *ἡμεῖς*, *we* emphatically in the fourth verse. "But *we* (Apostles) will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word." When the selection was made, then followed the public appointment to office, in which the whole assembly joined; and to this succeeded laying on of hands, with prayer. If we take the use of the verb *καθίστημι* here as a guide, we may at once see, that it does not at all correspond with the meaning of our English word *ordain*, as connected with the present subject. It means, appointment to office. But ordination means a ceremony performed by a certain ecclesiastical minister, or ministers, investing another with a clerical character, and authorizing him to perform clerical functions; and the part of the business to which it bears the nearest resemblance is, the laying on of hands with prayer. That Titus performed this ceremony, as representing the Apostle, I do not doubt; though I deny that we can certainly infer it from any thing in the passage under our review. Upon the whole, I think the case is as I said. Titus was to see that elders were appointed, and that those elders answered to the character given of them by Paul: but he was to do as Paul had "ordained, in all the Churches." There was to be no departure from established usage: the people were to look out among themselves for men of the description wanted. When "set before" Titus, he was to exercise his judgment, and join the Church in their appointment, and then to lay his hands upon them, with prayer. If my friend R. D.'s view were admitted, it might magnify the office of Titus; but it would imply a state of things that we know did not exist in the primitive Church; one at variance with the testimony of all the writers who have transmitted to us a record of the constitution of the first Christian assemblies.*

I come now to the second complaint of my friend R. D., namely, that I deny to the Established Church the benefit of the precedent afforded by the case of Titus and Timothy, in support of diocesan episcopacy. But where does R. D. find either Titus

* The following passage is from Mosheim, chap. ii. section vi. "It was, therefore, the assembly of the people which chose their own rulers and teachers, or received them by a free and authoritative consent, when recommended by others. The same people rejected or confirmed, by their suffrages, the laws which were proposed by their rulers to the assembly: excommunicated profligate and unworthy members of the Church: restored the penitent to their forfeited privileges: passed judgment upon the different subjects of controversy and dissension that arose in their community. Examined and decided the disputes which happened between the elders and deacons; and, in a word, exercised all that authority which belongs to such as are invested with the sovereign power."—*A Little Republic*.

or Timothy called a bishop? Timothy is expressly denominated *an evangelist*, and no question exists as to the identity of their offices. I know my friend R. D. says that the name is of no consequence, provided the thing is admitted. I do not quite agree with him; for I think to call a man a *bishop*, and to identify his office with that of *an evangelist*, constitutes a presumption that there is something of a dubious character in the matter in question. If Titus and Timothy were bishops, why should they be called evangelists, and not bishops? But waiving this, I say that there is a substantial distinction between the office of Titus and that of a diocesan bishop. Titus was appointed by Paul to take his place in Crete for a season; to bring into order the imperfectly organized societies; and when this was done, to return to the apostle. A diocesan minister, or a bishop, holds a permanent office, and exercises a territorial jurisdiction. Let me, moreover, remind my friend R. D. that for the three first centuries no one derived the bishop's office from that of Titus and Timothy, nor thought of confounding the episcopal functions with those of an evangelist. My friend R. D. then, has no right, I think, to blame me, if I deny that modern episcopacy derives any legitimate support from the case of Titus or of Timothy. And this brings me to the solemn appeal which my friend makes to my candour and that of our readers, in page 116, on this important subject. He writes as follows: "I would put it to the candour of Mr. Kelly and of your readers, whether a diocese, with a bishop presiding, superintending, ordaining, and elders, presbyters, (why not *bishops*, *ἐπισκοποι*?) instructing in each congregation, does not more resemble Crete, with its overseer and elders, (why not, I say again, *bishops*?) ordained by him in every city, than Mr. Kelly's little republic of individuals in a state of equality, without subordination or laying on of hands?" Had my friend introduced the word *bishop* in the two places where I notice its omission, the reader would have been better able to form a judgment on the subject about which his decision is called for, and therefore I feel as if I had some right to complain of such omission. But, waiving this point, let me ask my friend R. D. what becomes of the resemblance that he wishes to establish, when Titus, in obedience to the summons of the apostle, meets him at *Nicopolis*, Titus, iii. 12; or when he goes "to Dalmatia," 2 Tim. iv. 10. The bishop attending his *parliamentary* duties is the nearest thing to Titus leaving his post at Crete that I know of. Seriously, will my friend R. D. on reflection insist upon the case of Titus as affording a precedent for diocesan episcopacy, and thus endeavour to establish an identity between two things which were clearly distinguished during the three first centuries of Christianity?

But I cannot allow my friend's picture of such a society as I am pleading for, to pass without some observation upon it. He calls it "a little republic of individuals in a state of equality, without subordination or laying on of hands." For a republic

in its *political* sense, I have no particular fancy; but I will confess I do not see how the principles of the New Testament can be brought into operation without such a social constitution as may give the Christian community something of a republican character. But do not let R. D. suppose that the principles for which I am pleading are inconsistent with order and subordination; the reverse, I hope I may truly say, is the case. When a church appoints elders, it renounces a state of equality; but, in doing so, no member of the congregation puts his conscience in the keeping of the elders. He does not pledge himself to any act of obedience, unless it comes recommended by the authority of the written word. If the elders cannot sustain themselves by a reference to that only recognized standard, the Church, if in a right state of mind, will not go with them: nor ought it. But my friend R. D. greatly mistakes me, if he imagines that because I say a society composed of such elements as a Christian Church is supposed to consist of, may be safely trusted with the administration of principles purely spiritual, therefore, a congregation such as he contemplates, is in circumstances to admit of the same rule of proceeding being applied to them. Very far from it! I readily admit, that if Christianity is to take the shape of an Established Church, rituals, liturgies, and formularies are necessary. How far this fact goes to render its character doubtful, is matter of serious consideration for those whom it may concern. When I am speaking of a Christian church, I am speaking of an assembly composed of persons whose consciences are in subjection to the authority of God. Such a society may be occasionally disturbed, as was the case with the apostolic churches; but if it does not abandon its principles, or repudiate their practical influence, things will come right again.

My friend R. D. thinks he finds "an example of a diocesan bishop, or an individual overseeing many elders and congregations, in the angel of the seven churches of Asia." This is a manifest oversight; there is no such expression as the *angel* of the seven churches. "The seven stars are the *angels* of the seven churches." With *diocesan* episcopacy it can then have nothing to do. Had the word *αγγελος* been *translated*, instead of being modified into an English word, there would have been no temptation, I think, to have referred to it for authority to sustain the cause of episcopacy. To be called *an angel* may be a flattering distinction, even to a bishop. To be identified with a *messenger* has nothing in it gratifying to human ambition. At all events, whatever place the *messenger*, *αγγελος*, may occupy on the *superscription*, the letter itself is addressed to the church.

In justice to myself, and indeed to my friend Mr. Burgh, I cannot pass over an inadvertent misquotation into which R. D. has been betrayed. "Mr. Kelly," he says, addressing himself to Mr. Burgh, "says, page 44, 'you would say of diocesan Episcopacy, that it is *unscriptural*, not *antiscriptural*.' I am sure Mr. Burgh would say no such thing," page 116. And I am quite

as sure of it as my friend R. D. can be. Indeed it would be a very silly thing for me to have said: and R. D. will, by looking at my letter, see that I did not say *un* but *nonscriptural*. Mr. Burgh has studiously avoided the use of the word *unscriptural*, because, I suppose, it conveys the idea, if not of actual disapprobation, at least of discountenance. I could not, therefore, have imagined that he would have allowed the term to be applicable to so important a part of the system which he pleads for, as *diocesan Episcopacy*. But that he should admit this institution to be *nonscriptural*, I can easily conceive: thinking that he might, and indeed supposing that he *does* consider it as belonging to those *apostolic rapadooses*, which, as he contends, though not susceptible of proof from the written word, are yet to be retained because they are or may have been originally enjoined upon the Churches by the Apostles.

"I am not surprised," R. D. says, page 117, "at Mr. Kelly's most candid and honest confession of the bad working of his system. 'The very liberty afforded by our principles, becomes, by abuse,' says he, 'the source of internal disorder.' 'I feel well-assured it could not be otherwise.' And does my friend R. D. imagine that this was not written with deliberation, and with the fullest conviction that no *legitimate* inference could be derived from it against the principles for which I am contending? Would the Gospel be good news to sinners, if it did not furnish a pretext for the conclusion, 'Let us do evil that good may come?' Assuredly it would not. Could the disorders that occurred at Corinth have taken place, if the constitution of the Church did not recognize a *liberty* which furnished an occasion for the irregularities that the apostle condemns, but for the correction of which he applies nothing but moral principle? I think not. The character of the thing I am pleading for is just that which unfits it for any system in which the authority of God over the conscience is not fully and exclusively recognized. As soon as ever the first Churches had become degenerate, a new system of government and administration became necessary, in order to keep the elements of which they were composed from dispersion. It was then that councils began to frame canons for the regulation of men's conduct, under circumstances not contemplated in the New Testament, and therefore not provided for. But does my friend R. D. mean to intimate that *power* is not liable to abuse, as well as *liberty*? I am sure he does not. He knows well that the mystical Babylon is the abuse, not of *liberty*, but of *power*. Trace it to its source, and you discover it in the *legitimate* authority of the elders. The first workings of "the mystery of iniquity" are detected in the selfish conduct of such men as *Diotrephes*. As far as facts go, Christians have more reason to be jealous of the abuse of *power* than that of *liberty*.

The real and the important question between my friend R. D. and myself, relates to the elements of which a Christian Church, in its proper acceptation, is composed. What does it signify

even if a man should be right on the question of *form*, if he is wrong on that of *principle*? Suppose R. D. could prove that diocesan Episcopacy were a scriptural institution, of what advantage would this be to him in the main argument, if the institution is to be applied, *not* to the disciples of Christ, but to the population of a district? What I contend for is, that the economy of Christian Churches cannot lawfully be applied, except under scriptural circumstances, and for scriptural purposes; and that, where this principle is invaded, whether in connection with the state, or in a state of separation from it, there is, in the very nature of the transaction, a profanation of holy things.

I have been supposed to have made concessions in my former letter which I certainly did not intend to make, and which I do not think I did make. I have been supposed to have said as much as that the principles for which I was contending, had, upon trial, worked badly. I certainly said the very reverse, unless there be no difference between principles *working badly*, and being *badly worked*: and unless, again, no allowance is to be made for unfavourable circumstances and untoward events. I have been supposed to admit, that the Established Church worked well, because I said that God had wrought marvellously among its members, both clergy and people, and because I said that as eminent examples of personal godliness were to be found within the pale of that community, as far as I knew, as among any other class of persons professing Christianity; as if I had not carefully distinguished between the work of God among the members of the Established Church, and the system with which they are identified. I see no occasion to retract what I said in my former letter. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I have no fear of facts, as if they could disturb principles. It is with all the facts before my eyes, that some might interpret in favour of the Established Church, that I continue in my separation from it. It is also with all the facts full in my view, from which some might draw inferences unfavourable to the principles for which I have been contending, that I adhere pertinaciously to those principles. In doing so, however, I embrace, in Christian affection, all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. I wish to accompany them as far as they follow Christ; and when I cannot go with them any farther, I wish to express my reasons for dissent without asperity. "To their own master they stand or fall." But I should not leave the impression I desire to leave, if I did not express my decided conviction that the system to which they are attached, as such, brings them into direct collision with the fundamental principles upon which the first Churches, *as societies*, were constructed.

I am, dear Sir, yours,

THOMAS KELLY.

* * Pursuant to our usual practice, we, at Mr. Kelly's request, give his reply to R. D. a place in our EXAMINER, acknowledging that we disagree with the pious writer. His paper is written in the spirit of meekness with which a controversy amongst Christians should be conducted.—ED.

ST. DOULOUGH'S.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—Be so good as to insert the following contradiction of a misstatement I made in my description of St. Doulough's Church, which you were pleased to publish in your number for February. I therein (adopting the information which my respected friend, Mr. Robert Armstrong, had gleaned from the people residing near the church) had said that "a person of fortune, named Newenham, who lived in the neighbourhood, had, with a set of drunken companions, defiled the well, &c. &c. A very respectable gentleman, William Newenham, Esq., son of the late Sir Edward Newenham, has written in justly indignant terms, requiring of me to contradict this statement, inasmuch as it was likely to apply to his father, who resided for some time at Belcamp, near St. Doulough's, and who, to use Mr. N.'s expression, "did not about 80 or 90 years since, accompanied with a drunken party, defile the well, or take or carry away any stones therefrom; but about the year 1768, he did, as High Sheriff of the county of Dublin, under the direction of Government, with a military escort, disperse a drunken profligate set of people assembled there on the anniversary of the patron Saint."

I am very glad to have it in my power to contradict a statement which I certainly would never have allowed to meet the public eye, had I for a moment reflected that this "person of fortune, named Newenham," could have been identified with Sir Edward or any of his family, who are not more remarkable for their ancient descent, than for their personal respectability.—I had the honour of being known to Sir Edward, and with his daughter (whom the St. Doulough traditionist reported to have, in retributive vengeance for her father's sacrilege, fallen a victim to a fire which caught her clothes while dressing for a ball,) I was intimately acquainted; and I know that she died quietly in her bed, under, I trust, the hope and peace of the Gospel; therefore, I could not have intended to have implicated persons with whom I was well acquainted, in any such misdemeanour. I am altogether sorry I mentioned the name at all; it only shows how slow we should be in crediting or propagating popular reports: doubtless, the neighbouring people of St. Doulough's, in vengeance for the dispersion which Sir Edward, in his official capacity, caused of those riotous assemblages on the patron-day, fastened this scandal on him, and so perverted a good and lawful deed into an act of riotous sacrilege.

While on the subject of St. Doulough's, I may mention that, since the printing of my paper in your pages, I have met with a very interesting article in that ably conducted religious periodical, the *British Magazine* for January last, which gives a description of some Roman buildings in the Castle of Dover, and particularly

a Pharos, or Watch Tower, built, as is supposed, by Publius Ostorius Scapula, one of the first Roman generals who landed in Britain. This building is composed of alternate layers of bricks and squared pieces of a stalactical substance, called tufa, which the writer says was probably brought from the coast of France, near Boulogne, where it was used in the erection of a similar watch-tower. Mr. Lyons, in his History of Dover, considers the employment of this tufa in the construction of the Pharos, as a proof of the early date of the building. It is a curious circumstance, that in two of the oldest buildings in Ireland, St. Dou-lough's and Hohm-Patrick, the same material should be used; it singularly corroborates what I have said as to the Irish bringing much of the materials employed in the erection of their sacred edifices from France.

C. O.

PROGRESS OF POPISH SUPERSTITION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

As a specimen of the gradual progress of Popish superstition, take the following. In 1217 Innocent the Third was the first who ordered boxes to be kept in the Church for holding the wafer which they call the Host. In 1220 Honorius the Third ordered that *hic Deum adora*, should be inscribed on the boxes, and that the wafer should be elevated. In 1230 Gregory the Ninth ordered that a bell should be rung at the elevation of the wafer. In 1264 *Corpus Christi*, a festival in honor of the wafer, was instituted from the pretended revelation of a Nun. In 1360 processions with the wafer commenced, and all were commanded to pay it reverence.

I now produce an instance, founded *on fact*, which exhibits clearly the lamentable ignorance of our poor benighted countrymen, who profess the Faith of Rome. Some time ago, a labourer in the employment of a gentleman, the friend of the writer, having been absent for one day from his work, was asked by his master, on the ensuing morning, the cause of his neglect. The reply was—"Sir, it was a great holiday." "What holiday?" "I think it was Corpus Christi they call him." "Well, now, tell me what is Corpus Christi?" "Myself does not well know; but I believe he was some great saint in our Church."

M.

NOTICE OF BOOKS.

Sacred Portraiture and Illustrations, with other Poems, by Mrs. John G. Guinness; dedicated by permission to the Viscountess De Vesci. Dublin; Richard M. Tins, and Wm. Curry, Jun. and Co. 1834.

These poems; as written by a lady who, we believe, is no authoress by practice or profession—who, as far as we know, has now come before the public for the first time; would be entitled to great leniency of criticism, more especially when it is the fact that they have been published, not for fame, or for private emolument, but in order to advance exclusively a most interesting charitable purpose. But independent of these considerations, we can assure our readers that Mrs. Guinness is a very sweet poetess, and handles Scripture facts and sacred subjects with a taste and execution that would not disgrace a more popular and experienced writer. The aim of the pious and poetic authoress is, to treat Scripture subjects in a way calculated to excite the best feelings of the heart, and to impress the mind of the reader with a conviction of the deep importance of the truth of the Gospel. The work is well calculated for the library table of those who love sweet, tasteful, and religious poetry.

Memoirs of the Council of Trent, principally derived from Manuscript and unpublished Records, &c. &c., with Plates; by the Rev. Joseph Meudham, M.A. London; Jas. Duncan, 1834.

Mr. Meudham, whose industry of research into all the mystery of iniquity of the Church of Rome, has increased the obligations which the Protestant world owes him, by the publication of these Memoirs. He had, with his keen wish to serve the cause of truth, by detecting the monstrous errors of that mighty superstition that has overshadowed the fair face of Christianity, succeeded in purchasing a collection of MS. folio volumes, formerly the property of the Earl of Guilford, and which originally constituted a portion of

some extensive Italian Library. From this collection he has mainly extracted these Memoirs, which are extremely interesting, and which should form part of the library of all those who desire to be acquainted fully with the secret and foul intrigues of that congregation of Papal creatures, who look upon them in the guise of a General Council, to fix the Catholic Faith of Christendom.

Mr. Meudham dedicates his volume to Pope Gregory the Sixteenth, as follows:—"To Gregory the Sixteenth, Sovereign and Pontiff of Rome; to whom it is competent to attempt the only means, which adopted would be effectual, of exonerating the Church from the continued charge of superstition and idolatry, of perfidy, cruelty, and assumed dominion over secular Sovereigns, by calling a Council for the express purpose of condemning and abolishing every enormity which classes itself under those respective heads, the present Memoirs of a Council, to which, with others, they are principally indebted for their origin and establishment, are not irreverently addressed by one of the best wishers to his temporal and eternal welfare.—THE AUTHOR."

We have a strong desire to give a detailed review of this important work, in which, circumstances permitting, we hope to be able to indulge.

Edinburgh Cabinet Library. An Historical and Descriptive Account of Persia, from the earliest ages to the present time, &c. &c., by Jas. B. Fraser, Esq.; Author of "The Travels in Khorasan," "A Tour through Nimala," &c. &c.

This work is, to the full, as creditable to the spirited publishers of the Edinburgh Cabinet Library as the former one on Arabia. Mr. Fraser, the author, is well known by his faithful and extremely amusing description of Lesser India, Khorasan, and Persia. His painful travels through these climes, and his local, connected with his historical

knowledge, admirably fitted him for the present undertaking; and besides his own personal acquaintance with many parts of the great country he describes, he has faithfully availed himself of the observations of the greater number of modern travellers, and of modern as well as ancient historians. Altogether it is a highly amusing, as well as instructive work, ornamented with many illustrative plates, and more especially, with a good and convenient map, which far exceeds every other geographical delineation of Persia.

Sacred Classics, or Cabinet Library of Divinity. Edited by the Rev. R. Cattermole, B.D., and the Rev. H. Stebbing, M.A. Vol. I. Hatchard and Son, London; Cumming, Dublin. 1834.

The Publishers of the Cabinet Library of Divinity have done well in commencing their labours with a work of the sweet Chrysostom of England, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, whose various and yet minute learning, whose logical precision, whose vividly poetic mind, whose unequalled tone of candour and moderation, place him in the first rank of English Divines. In the present day perhaps this will prove the most acceptable of the Bishop of Down's writings, being, as Locke well defined it, the most distinguished treatise on religious liberty in our language. Strange that he who owed his rise in life to Primate Laud—who certainly wielded the fearful power of the Star Chamber in repressing the liberty of prophesying, should become the devoted advocate of toleration; but it is good to learn in the school of adversity, and it is well to consider that when this treatise appeared, the cause of Episcopacy and of the Church of England needed that toleration which the good Prelate so warmly challenged.

The Rainbow, a Literary Gift. Dublin; Gibbon and Overend, 1834.

It certainly is a pleasing characteristic of the age, that amid all the

bustle and noise excited by the demand for cheap literature, there should also exist a great desire for those neatly printed, and tastefully selected volumes, which are to be seen in such numbers on the booksellers' counters. It proves to a certainty that both the moral feeling and the natural taste of our youth are rising far above what the standard was in the spring-time of the generation now gone by, or, at least, rapidly descending into the grave, and should induce us to rejoice in a change so beneficial to the moral health of the community.

The present little volume is one of the class to which we allude; it is the literary gift of a young and amiable lady to her pupils—a gift of which they ought to be proud, and which is truly honorable to the heart, eye, and the head of the fair preceptress. We know not how to introduce it better than by letting the lady introduce herself—though that might be esteemed rather an ungallant act, by severer critics than we profess to be.

"A small book requires but a short preface; nor indeed should I have prefixed one to this diminutive volume, were it not that some explanation might be required, as to the title bestowed on, and the motive for compiling it.

"As, then, it is a compilation, I have entitled it 'THE RAINBOW;' for the beauty of this arch of heaven is not inherent. It but borrows from a brighter source—it soon fades away, but it dissolves into a fertilizing dew, and if but one flower blooms the brighter for it, it has not shone in vain.

"Yet all in this volume is not borrowed; a few original articles are inserted, which, though far from pretending to an equal rank with the productions of those gifted authors from whom the selections were principally made, yet, as being written in the same spirit, may perhaps claim indulgence.

"My motive for making these se-

lections arose, principally, from a wish to afford, if possible, combined pleasure and instruction to the young friends to whom the volume is dedicated; in the improvement of whose hearts and minds need I say that I feel deeply interested? The lighter branches of education may, as an eminent divine expressed himself, be termed but *embossed* work—I should prefer what is *inlaid*. What is pleasing or useful to a few, may, perhaps, be so to many; and in that hope I present this unpretending volume to the public."

After this modest and truly *lady-like* introduction, we would only say to our readers, if you are making literary presents to your young friends, let the *Rainbow* be amongst the number. It is a little work *got up*, to use the common phrase, with extreme neatness; and in its typography is another proof of the as-

tonishing change which has taken place in this respect in Dublin, within a very few years. And those who remember that truly respectable periodical, "The Dublin Literary Gazette," will recognize, in the signature of the editor of the "*Rainbow*," (Mtt. S.) a correspondent whose contributions were uniformly received with favour and affection. Of the original articles in the little book, we may mention, "The Death of Attila," "Lines on a Celtic Monument," "A day at 'Le College Bourbon,'" and "Lines to J. L.," all of which display taste and feeling far above mediocrity, while the selections are excellent. We trust that both the amiable and talented editor, and her ingenious and tasteful printer, will soon be induced, by the success of the present pretty little work, to present another *Rainbow*, not merely her pupils, but to the public.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE CHURCH TEMPORALITIES' BILL.

We beg to offer to our clerical friends an analysis of the Church 'Temporalities' Bill, as it affects the rank and succession of the bishops, and the taxation to which all incumbents, both episcopal and parochial, are liable—i. e., all whose incumbency commences subsequently to this new era in the constitution of the Irish Church. We annex the value of the Sees, according to the Parliamentary returns, and we do so the more willingly as it may tend to correct the gross misconceptions—perhaps it would be more correct to say, the misrepresentations—which prevail relative to the incomes of our bishops:

Sees retained.	Net income thereof.	Sees condemned.	Net income.
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
Armagh	14,077 0 3	Clogher	8,957 3 5
Down	7,796 18 0	Kilmore	Doubtful.
Cashel	6,503 5 2	Kilbane	4,110 0 0
Tuam	6,596 9 0	Kilbala	3,697 19 8
Meath	4,694 3 11	No change	
Down	4,250 17 7	Dromore	4,471 9 9
Derry	12,159 3 5	Raphoe	4,812 6 4
Kilmo e	6,807 9 1	Fipkin	5,096 14 3
Berns	5,494 15 1	Downy	3,243 11 6
Limerick	4,948 4 9	No change	4,943 4 9
Florence	4,210 0 0	Cork	1,132 10 11
Killaloe	4,132 17 5	Clonfert	3,918 23 0

N. B.—The Sees in the second column merge in those in the corresponding line in the first—the income of those suppressed becoming vested in the board.

TAXATION ON BISHOPRICS.

Where annual incomes do not exceed	£4,000..	£5 per cent.
Exceeding 4 and not exceeding	6,000..	7
Exceeding 6 and not exceeding	8,000..	10
Exceeding 8 and not exceeding	10,000..	12
All above this	..	15

TAXATION ON THE INCOME OF THE PAROCHIAL CLERGY.

All incomes UNDER £300	per annum free,	
£300 per annum	..	£2 10 per cent.
Every £10 over the sum is an increase of 5s., and when it reaches £400 it is	..	5 0 0
And 2s. 6d. increase on every 10l. till on an income exceeding 115l. it is	..	15 0 0

In the dioceses of Meath and Limerick, no change takes place, except with regard to taxation.

An option as to residence is given by the act where one see merges in another, except in the case of Cloyne and Ferns. The Bishop of Cloyne must reside in Cork; the Bishop of Ferns in Kilkenny.

The present Bishop of Derry is liable to an annual tax of £416, payable to the commissioners.—*Dublin Evening Packet.*

FOREIGN.

THE LORD'S DAY IN NEW ZEALAND.—It seems not improbable that, in reference to some religious duties, the people of the most uncivilized regions, once converted to Christianity, may rise up in judgment against those who are centuries old in the profession of Christianity, and condemn them. Witness the following account, by Mr. Davis, of the observation of the Lord's Day by the natives:

JUNE 25, 1832.—At this time there seems to be something more of a spirit of attention among the natives in the vicinity of this settlement than there was about two months ago. Our chapel could not contain the whole of our congregation yesterday, so that we shall have to enlarge it as soon as possible. Ripi and his party continue to listen with attention, and are steady in their attendance on the means of grace. The manner in which the Lord's Day is kept by this tribe would shame many country parishes in England, even where the Gospel is faithfully preached. Their firewood is always prepared, and their potatoes scraped and got ready on the Saturday afternoon, to be cooked on the Lord's Day; and this is no new thing, as they have proceeded in this way now for a long time. The natives are erecting a chapel of considerable size, as the present building will not contain the congregation.—*From the Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society. See Missionary Register.*

THE CHURCH IN RUSSIA.—The following statistical view, derived from the most authentic sources, will be found to supply many important points of information, not furnished either by writers on Church history, or on the general history and geography of that colossal state.

The Established Church in Russia is commonly known by the name of the Orthodox Greek Church, but at the same time all other denominations are tolerated—Jews, Mohammedans, Lámaites, Brahmana, and Shamarites.

Of the Established or Orthodox Greek Church, the members may be said to amount to 81,782,000. The Emperor is the head. With respect to its constitution and independence, it has no connexion with any of the four Patriarchs of the Oriental Church. The will of the Monarch is the highest point of appeal, but the business of the Church is under the management of the *Holy Synod*, in connexion with the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs. To this supreme legislative court, the Consistories and Clergy, both superior and inferior, are subject.

The *Consistories* are divided into three classes. The *first* class comprehends Kief, Moscow, Novogorod, and St. Petersburg; the *second*, Kazan, Astrakhan, Tobolsk, Jaroslaf, Pskof, Reazan, Tver, Jekaterinoslaf, Mohilef, Tshernigof, Minsk, and Podolia; and the *third*, Raluga, Smolensk, Nishegorod, Kursk, Vladimir, Vologda, Tula, Vialka, Archangel, Voronege, Irkusk, Kostroma, Tambof, Oral, Pultowa, Volhynia, Perm, Pensa, Slobodsk, Ukraine, and Oremburg. Each of these Consistories stands under the presidency of an Archihierei, or one of the dignified clergy, and forms an Eparchy.

The Clergy are divided into two classes, the secular and the regular Clergy:—1. The secular Clergy consist of the Archihierei or Eparchs, such as Metropolitans, Archbishops, and Bishops, the two former of which dignitaries are not confined to any particular Secs, but depend

simply on the will or favour of the monarch. Some of the dignified Clergy are liberated from the charge of administering the affairs of the diocese to which they are attached, and there are others who have no eparchy in Russia, but live there as titled dignitaries. The lower orders of the Clergy, such as Protopriests, Priests, and Deacons, also belong to the secular class.—2. The regular Clergy consist of Archimandrites, Priors and Prioreesses, Monks, Nuns, and Anchorites. Though the cloisters are not so numerous as they once were, there are still 460 monasteries and 70 nunneries. The number of Monks exceeds 8,000, and of Nuns about 1,500.

The number of churches in Russia amounts in all to 26,747, and that of the Clergy to 67,900 persons. Taking, however into the account the additional number of individuals attached to the Clergy for the use of the Church, not fewer than 158,475 persons are dependent on the altar for subsistence.

These are, for the most part, paid out of the public funds, government having, since 1764, secularized the lands belonging to most of the churches and monasteries; some, however, still retain their appropriated lands.

The great proportion of the clergy who receive their education in the ecclesiastical seminaries, and at the four existing academies, are exceedingly ignorant. Few of them are versed in the higher branches of science, and there is every reason to fear that fewer still are imbued with the genuine spirit of Christianity. Vast numbers of them are barely qualified to repeat the Church Service, and, were it not for the clerical habiliments, scarcely distinguishable from the lowest of the people. They are only permitted to marry once, and are prohibited from marrying widows. Their sons devote themselves to the same profession, and from them the demand for the future clergy is supplied. The archihierei are obliged to remain in a state of celibacy.

No person who is a member of

the National Church is allowed, whatever may be his convictions, to leave that Church and join any other communion; and all who join it from other communions must submit to become catechumens, and receive the rite of baptism according to the Greek forms. L.

SWITZERLAND.

An almost general effervescence is manifesting itself in the Roman Catholic parts of Switzerland, since the recent political events of which it was the theatre. The College of Soleure has undergone a reform, which has separated from it the members who were most imbued with ultra-montane principles. In the canton of Argovie, voices are heard in an energetic manner to protest against the synods which the Council of Trent had ordered, and which had scarcely ever been convoked. The Roman Catholic Grisons, thwarted by the bishop in their intention of ameliorating the rural schools, go forward without caring for these obstacles. In the Canton of Lucerne, the distribution of the Bible is done publicly, even under the eyes of the Pope's Nuncio.

But all is not bounded by this—courageous men, of the Romish clergy, are not afraid of blowing the trumpet of the glorious Gospel of Christ, to call the people of Roman Catholic Switzerland to return to him. At the head of these remarkable men may be placed Aloys Fuchs: it is to him that we devote this article. Born at Schwitz in 1794, of respectable parents, Fuchs passed his youth there, and frequented the schools of that place, which were then in a deplorable state. Afterwards, having passed some time in the Convent of Fieschingen, he studied at Lucerne, of which the theological school was renowned as the best in the Roman Catholic part of Switzerland. He then passed some time afterwards at the University of Landshut in Baviere, where the famous Professor Seiler then taught, who was since Bishop of Ratisben, and died in 1832: it is

probably to Seiler that Fuchs is indebted for the gospel lights that he possesses, and the interior awakening which grace has operated in him. On returning to Schwitz, in 1816, Fuchs was there placed in an honorable way, as professor. He carried there an ardent zeal for good. He interested himself at first about the propagation of the Holy Scriptures, and saw with regret that the moment to disperse the Sacred Volume into all the houses of the Canton was not yet come.

Tired with the (Romish) holidays which are still celebrated in great numbers at Schwitz, he continued his school during part of the day. He met thence a lively opposition, which many acts of courage and of devotion to his conscience only augmented; and though he had the approbation of unprejudiced people, and particularly of his old Professor Seiler, he thought that he ought to leave Schwitz for a time. He had for some time the project of going to Rome, to see nearer to him, as Luther did, the abuse of the Papal court; however, he could not put this project into execution.

In 1824 we find him again in his mountains, where he occupied for four years the cure of Biemenstalder, which other ecclesiastics would not accept, on account of its wild situation on the rocks which bound the Canton of Uri. Contemplating from these heights the valley of Schwitz, he ceased not crying over the state of darkness which his country was in—without ceasing, however, to hope that light would soon disperse its rays upon this cradle of Helvetic liberty.

For a long time, a more liberal spirit (in the best sense of the word) had appeared in the Canton of St. Gall (a Romish Canton:) in 1828 Fuchs was called there, as professor and chaplain of the hospital. He developed himself there more and more; and, the events of 1830 having given him liberty to publish his principles more openly, he appeared from that time as an eloquent and courageous preacher of the Gospel of salvation. At last, on the 13th

of May, 1832, he preached a sermon, since become celebrated in all Switzerland, and which may be considered as the token of his rupture with the doctrines of Rome. This discourse, of which I am going to give you the analysis, was received with bitterness by some ultra-Romish men, who carried a complaint of it to the Council of the Canton. But the greater part of the auditors protested against the complaint, and demanded the publication of the discourse. Successive editions were distributed, without delay, in all the German Roman Catholic parts of Switzerland. All the public papers hastened to inform their readers of the light which began to shine on the confines of the Lake of Zurich. The day, even, that Fuchs preached the sermon, was for him a day of glory. In the afternoon the orator took a walk, accompanied by the clergy, who led him as it were in triumph. The Bishop of Coire and of St. Gall, M. de Buola, brother of the late President of the Germanic Diet, having seen how a great a part of the clergy applauded the sentiments announced in this sermon, made an inquiry; and in January, 1833, Fuchs was cited before the Episcopal Consistory of St. Gall. The first sitting of this Romish assembly took place on the 15th of February. They began by reading a minute of the proceedings, which condemned eight principal points of the sermon in question. These are the condemned points—

1st. Christianity does not acknowledge the difference which Romanism establishes between the priests and the laity.

2d. The essence of the constitution of the Catholic Church is to be purely representative.

3d. It is necessary that the better part of the clergy rise up, after a sleep of three hundred years, to reclaim their precious rights.

4th. You have made a dictator of our Holy Father.

5th. The Roman Catholic Church has need of an essential reform in worship, liturgy, and discipline; for it is no more than a skeleton.

6th. Our Liturgic tongue (the Latin) hinders and disfigures the worship.

7th. Forced celibacy takes away all value from chastity.

8th. It is a want of reason to call those heretics and revolutionaries who demand Synods and disapprove of celibacy, seeing there are entire bishoprics (in the East) of which the priests are married.

Fuchs could only obtain that the accusation should be remitted to him, and it was with difficulty that it was granted to him that his replies should be inserted in the minutes of the proceedings. At the second meeting of this Assembly, Fuchs was condemned, deprived of his pastoral functions, suspended as to those of the mass, with reserve against him the other canonical penalties. His sermon was condemned as contrary to the dogmas of the church.

Fuchs addressed himself to the Pope's Nuncio, that his cause might be sent to his legitimate judge, who should be designated, according to him, by the Synod of the Bishopric of St. Gall; but the Nuncio replied, that the only thing that remained for him to do was to make a simple appeal to the Papal seat, which Fuchs declined.

The decree which condemned him gave rise to numerous petitions, addressed, in favour of Fuchs, to the great council of the Canton of St. Gall. The general opinion of the Swiss Roman Catholics pronounced with force for Fuchs.

From that time he has made a step forward against Rome, by forming a religious Society under the name of the "Evangelical Catholic Society," which held its first sitting in the month of May, this year. It has announced in its statutes that its principal end is to provide for the advancement of the true Catholic faith in spirit and in truth, to oppose itself to all fanaticism, and to enlighten the people by writings calculated to spread the light of Christianity. Many distinguished members of the church of St. Gall and Soleure, of Lucerne and Argovie, form a part of it.

RENUNCIATION OF POPERY.

Mr. Smith, after being long a Roman Catholic priest, is brought, we believe, by the grace of God, to a true knowledge of the Gospel of Christ, is converted, and brought into the fold of the Blessed Shepherd and Bishop of souls. In the midst of his successful career, and prospects of advancement, a favorite of the late Roman Catholic Bishop Fenwick, and caressed by the dignitary, M. Rese, he renounces his living, gives up his flattering prospects, makes all the sacrifices that a man can make in the world, embraces poverty, reproach, and the contumely and persecution of his former friends, and throws himself on the providence of God for the humblest sustenance.

Few men know more of the abominations of Popery, and the flagitious lives of its clergy, than he does. He speaks and writes, not what he has heard, but of what he has seen.

His book is well written: he is a modest, amiable, and sensible man; very unassuming and diffident; and we can see the man breathing out his intelligent and illumined soul on his humble pages. His book will be read with avidity and the deepest interest.—*New York Observer*.

POPERY IN SWITZERLAND.—The following facts and observations from M. Brockeden's interesting "Excursions in the Alps," are calculated to give rise to reflections applicable nearer home. "It is impossible (says this amusing writer) to notice the filth, the laziness, and beggary of the inhabitants of the Catholic cantons of Switzerland—of these the Tessin are, perhaps, the worst—without be-

lieving that the religion of the State in which these unfortunate people live, is either a direct or the remote cause of their degradation, or that it operates as a powerful check to their advancement to such a state of social comfort and moral worth as their neighbours enjoy, who are less under the terrors of the Catholic Church and the influence of its priesthood. Where the confessional subjects every one to the chance of the abuses of its privileges, no man's cottage is a sanctuary from the intrusions of the priest, whose violations of decorum and abuses of the confidence which he claims for his calling, become an example which his precepts cannot check; so much for the minister. Then the Church demands, to sustain its influence and prove its power, so great a portion of the time of the labouring man, that fêtes, fasts, and processions, in honour of the Virgin and the Saints, take one-third of the hours God has given him for labour. It is not then to be wondered at that a people controlled by such religious observances as give a master to each man's mind, and can claim, under penalty, the utter waste of so much of his time, should lose the use of the energies they dare not display, and be impoverished, by being robbed of that time which, being usefully employed, would establish habits of industry, and reward their exercise with health and competence. It is not prejudice, but a fact, that the line which separates a Catholic from a Protestant Canton, is more decidedly marked by the squalid and poverty-stricken appearance of the people in one, contrasted with the look of independence among those of the other, than by any geographical line of demarcation."

ERRORS OF THE IRISH BIBLE.

THE FIRST PART

OF

DOCTOR CHARLES ORPEN'S PROOFS

OF A FEW OF THOSE ERRORS;

IN REPLY TO

A LETTER, BY H. M. M. ON THAT SUBJECT,

IN

The Dublin Christian Examiner Magazine,

FOR

SEPTEMBER, 1888.

PREFATORY POSTSCRIPT.

February 28th, 1834.

It is unnecessary, to trouble the reader, at present, with the history of the circumstances, which, in deference to others, induced me to postpone, until now, the publication of this article, though it was written last September, immediately on the appearance of H.M.M.'s letter, in the *Christian Examiner* for that month, and was all in type, (except needful corrections and several additions,) in October last. Suffice it to say, that my motives were,—1st, if possible to induce H.M.M. on better information, to acknowledge publicly in the *Examiner*, that he had made injurious and unfounded assertions, as to me, Mr. Thaddæus Connellan and Dr. Fitzgerald, in that article; which would have rendered it unnecessary for me, to make any part of my reply personal, by an exposure either of the negligent manner, in which he and others had managed the publication of the Irish Bible, or of the disingenuous way, in which he had conducted some parts of his argument;—and 2ndly, to obtain, if possible, a pledge that those, whether individuals or Societies, who had edited that Bible, would unite with us, in a *bona fide* revision and correction of the whole, including the expunging of the errors shown in this paper; which would have made it less necessary for me, to bring public opinion to bear upon this matter, as a means of enforcing or ensuring such an amendment of the translation. Had they done these two things, I would assuredly have consented to withdraw the paper finally.

I could not enter into the details of the circumstances, which have since destroyed my expectations of succeeding in either of these objects, without stating matters, as to individuals, which I would rather bury in oblivion; and I shall therefore not do so now, nor at any future time, unless where compelled by any misrepresentations being circulated, or by some new attack on myself, or my friends. I shall merely say, at present, that two individuals, to whom I entrusted, in confidence, as well as to a few others, (at the request of those, who had acted with them, in that publication,) proofs of this article, all marked "For _____'s private perusal and correction," and "for your own eyes only, and no others, and therefore not to be left about the room," &c. &c. (with other expressions of confidence, and injunctions of privacy,) and this, with a sincere view to correct any defects of manner or matter in it, have not only refused to return me my proof-sheets, but have actually availed themselves of them, to write answers, before it was finally corrected, or in any way published. Both of these answers I have seen in print; and this, while my paper was uncorrected, and while I was tied up by a promise, solicited by the Society, with which they had acted, in the publishing of the Irish Bible, to postpone for a while the publication of my paper. When they are fully published, I shall answer them. I have availed myself of almost all the suggestions made by others, who kindly returned me my proofs, some with valuable suggestions, but many with contradictory advice, and mutually neutralising criticisms; but I have not made any alterations or additions, in consequence of seeing the above-named two attempts to answer; lest I should prevent their publication.

If any one states, that I, of my own accord, shewed the proofs of this paper to any, except six or eight relations or personal friends, to ask their corrections, he states what is not true. Its being lent, as above stated, to the Members of the two Committees, connected with the Irish Bible, was at the suggestions of the Sub-committee of one of them, who asked the postponement of its publication, and their perusal of it, as a favour.

C. E. H. O.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Reader, in perusing this paper, will please to remember,
—1st, what, *Negatively*, its OBJECTS are *not*, viz.—

1st. Not to prove, that Roman Catholics never use "*Aithrige*," for "*Repentance*," in their sense of it, nor "*Deanaim Aithrige*," for "*Repent*," in their sense of it; for I have fully shown in the paper, that they do sometimes so use them.

2nd. To prove, that "*Aithreachas*," or "*Deanaim Aithreachas*," or "*Gabhaim Aithreachas*," or any other word, or phrases, should be almost every where used, to translate both *μετάνοια* & *μεταμέλειαι*, and all their derivatives; as the Gaelic Bible very incorrectly does.

—And 2ndly, what, *Positively*, the OBJECTS of the paper are, viz.—

1st. To prove, that "*Aithrige*" and "*Deanaim Aithrige*," in Ireland, are used 99 or 999 times, for the complex and Sacramental ideas of "*Penance*" and "*Do Penance*," as these are defined in all Popish *Catechisms*, for once that they are used, for the simple ideas of "*Repentance*" and "*Repent*," even in their own imperfect view of the meaning of these words.

2nd. To prove, that "*Breath-Aithrige*," (or "*Breitheamhnus-Aithrige*,") never means "*Penance*" simply, as confounded by Romanists with "*Repentance*," but always a special bodily or external "*penance enjoined*," or "*a sentenced—penance*," or "*injunction of penance*," after confession and absolution, and to be performed by visible acts, then ordered; and that this phrase never means a "*sentence or injunction of internal Repentance of mind or heart*," which expression would in fact be nonsense, as "*Repentance*," the Scripture says, is the gift of God, and always concerns only the heart and mind, as in his sight, and cannot be enforced by man on man, as "*Penance*" may; and that the word "*Breath*" (or "*Breitheamhnus*") means merely "*judgment*" or "*sentence*," or "*injunction*," whereas it is the united word "*Aithrige*," which in this phrase, as elsewhere, means "*Penance*" and not "*Repentance*."

3rd. That therefore the words "*Aithrige*" and "*Deanaim Aithrige*" are and ever will be, ambiguous to Roman Catholics, and dangerous to be used to them, in Ireland, and should be henceforth expunged totally from the Bible and from Scriptural Instruction, as was done in Scotland in both the Gaelic Bible and Catechisms.

4th. That as most of the Reformers objected to use "*Penance*," and "*Do Penance*," or "*Penitentia*," and "*Agere Penitentiam*," with all similar phrases, containing abused or ambiguous Popish Ecclesiastical words, in all English or other versions, so we should cease to use "*Aithrige*" and "*Deanaim Aithrige*," in the Irish Bible, if there were no reasons, except similar abuse and ambiguity, and even if the words could be proved, originally or primitively, to have meant mental "*Repentance*" and "*Repent*," which is now impossible. Derivations may be debateable, but the abuse is fatal, universal and undeniable, and the present common meaning is beyond all dispute.

5th. That the Roman Catholics of Ireland use "*Aithrige*" and "*Deanaim Aithrige*," in Irish, always to translate "*Penance*" and "*Do Penance*," from English, whether in books, Sermons, or conversations, and never use any other words; and that though they use "*Aithrige*" and "*Deanaim Aithrige*," sometimes for "*Repentance*" and "*Repent*," in their confused sense of these ideas; yet they never in Ireland use "*Aithreachas*," or "*Deanaim Aithreachas*," or "*Gabhaim Aithreachas*," for "*Penance*" or "*Do Penance*," but always to mean "*Repentance*" and "*Repent*;" and that therefore "*Aithrige*" is here a dangerous word, and "*Aithreachas*," &c. are not, without entering into the argument, whether the latter be the best word or words, or not; or whether other words or phrases are not more strictly correct renderings.

6th. That, as the Roman Catholic Irish Catechisms say word for word the same of "*Aithrige*" and "*Deanaim Aithrige*," that the Roman Catholic English Catechisms do of "*Penance*" and "*Do Penance*;"—therefore every argument, which states, that we may safely use the former words in the Irish Bible, will prove, that we might safely use the latter words in the English Bible, and every man, who advocates the retention of the former in Irish, as harmless, must advocate the substitution of the latter, for the words "*Repentance*" and "*Repent*," in all English and Protestant books, and especially in books for the Romanists of Ireland, "*quod est maxime absurdum*."

C. E. H. O.

22nd Feb. 1834.

THE FIRST PART

OF

DOCTOR CHARLES ORPEN'S REPLY TO H. M. M.

WITH PROOFS OF A FEW OF

THE ERRORS OF THE IRISH BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

DEAR SIR—In your last July No. (1833,) was a nameless criticism, on a Circular, entitled "*Irish Language, Education, and Sacred Scriptures*," (issued in June, and referring chiefly to Mr. T. Connellan's labours,) which had my name as one of its signatures. In the ensuing August No. you kindly inserted most of a reply, since considered, as I have learned, in various quarters, more than sufficient in matter, yet blameless in manner. And hence, although some parts, which were thought by me better, or even most material, had been left out by you;—especially my rejoinder to the extraneous attack on my professional character, by that Critic, and some few things, said to shew respect for Mr. T. Connellan;—yet conceiving, on the whole, substantial justice done to it, I had not intended any further reply, except the promised list of a few of the Irish Bible's glaring Errata, (as invited, and indeed defied by that Critic, in page 494, lines 11—16,) for insertion in a future No. when time and space might allow both me and you.

In the September No. appeared another criticism on that circular, with an attempt additionally to refute my answer, by a writer signing himself H. M. M. and filling fifteen pages. May I expect November, or December at farthest, to produce a third attack, with some other third Critic's name in full?

The first tried, by poor wit, unfounded ridicule, and perversion of our meaning, to turn public feeling against the objects of the circular, and failed;—the weak arguments, unjust insinuations, and mis-asserted facts of the second, had the same design, and shall have the same fate. What will the next be, and who the third Critic, to invite a similar catastrophe?

Your readers must surely have observed, that many parts of the two former criticisms were similar in spirit. Both too spoke the same language, and used the same weapons. Both Critics ridiculed the plans of the prospectus, as "*hulicrous*;" both sneered at "*Mr. Thaddæus*," though my reply had taught the second writer not to say "*Thady*," or "*Thadæus*," or to call him "*our friend*" "*Thaddæus*;" yet the latter only changed my "*respectable name*," into "*respectable signature*;" while both equally misrepresented the plainly expressed limitation of our circular's intention, to supply "*Irish Teachers*," or "*Teachers of Irish*," and "*Schoolmasters*," (these were our words,) with books, qualifying them to answer "*gainsayers*," as if it meant, "the enabling Mr. C. to supply the poor *Irish*-speaking *PEASANT*," with Hebrew and Greek "*Grammars and Lexicons*," and "*with*" Hebrew and Greek "*Concordances and Testament*," or were an "*an attempt to make a peasantry deep critics of the word*," (these are their misstatements.) Such studied and repeated perversion, to use the second Critic's own succeeding words, "*is a plan, which I leave to speak for itself!*" Were this merely a critique, (by the new writer, who signs himself H. M. M.) on the original circular, that paper, with the few corrections in its second edition, and my reply to the first, should stand by themselves, as ever sufficient answers, even by anticipation, to these and all other Autocratic Critics' cavils; but this latter going out of its road, to attack the moral character of others, and mine, (as that former one did my professional reputation,) I submit once more of necessity, to reply to this new attack; though my feelings must revolt at any such employment, either now or then, as both painful and even injurious to them.

Who either Critic is, I need not tell the public yet, as they both have chosen to omit their names, by which some readers may have imagined erroneously, that the second was perhaps a mere *alias*, or possibly *alter et idem*; choosing once a total innominateness, now H. is M., *agerty's M., insteters*' three initials. Whether too, the readers should have supplied the vowel I, for I, *rish*, or I, *mpertal*, (or some other vowel,) after the first initial, (to make this consonant name pronounceable,) or its cognate J, I suppose you and they have no anxiety to investigate;—nor whether this fourth initial might identify any author's name. But the latter writer's appellation, as he wished to be known only by initial letters, as a Tri or Tetra-grammaton, I shall not at present nominally indicate, except as he does, *TRILITERALLY*; for the original Circular cautiously avoided naming any Society or individual, as we wished to avoid giving offence; neither did my reply retort by so doing, although it answered fully the former criticism, which did both; yet this second Critic does worse, writing in such a way, as will make many readers understand him, as charging me, (falsely,) as being an informer, by whom "*information was conveyed anonymously*," with "*the watchfulness of the enemy*," (page 627); as having "*attempted*, in this gainsaying age, so to play into Satan's hands," (p. 623, 624,) as to be active in issuing a circular, than which "*the Pope, with all his Jesuits, could scarcely frame an encyclical letter*," with worse effects "*than this before us, were but this one passage generally read, and its contents believed*;" this critic asseverating his not having "*even in a Pope's letter, ever met with an assertion more untrue*," (p. 632,) than that, to which my name was signed. But an ill example, though twice set, I will not follow; nor will Mr. T. Connellan, although H. M. M. accuses "*Mr. Thaddæus*," as not "*straight-forward in his walk*," as "*jealous of that of others*," (page 632,) as going "*always hand in hand together*" with "*Mr. Owen Connellan*," of both of whom it says, (untruly), a "*corrupted version is the work*," (page 629); and thus misrepresents both, as "*corrupting the existing Irish, and even the Protestant versions*," (page 630); as being "*the Teucer and the Ajax*," of "*one firm*," named the "*Messrs. Connellans*," (I suppose the quiver of his organ of wit was exhausted, or he would have added, in order to make me one of this corrupting firm, "*& C. O.*") "*although one may solely shoot the arrows*,

and the other only bear the shield." (pages 639, 632.) Mr. T. Connellan, and myself and our other friends, will not condescend to retort such abuse, nor even to initiate the introduction of the names of third parties, needlessly into this controversy. Besides my obvious convenience is, (as it was in the case of the first Critic, whose name I did not know at all, until after my answer was published,) to reply only to the three-lettered H. M. M. and not to any known, supposed, or named individual; especially, because, to use his words, "some of the following remarks cannot but appear inimical to two or three individuals, but even they must in candour admit, that my silence hitherto affords evidence of Christian forbearance, while by far the greater majority will bear testimony, with my own conscience, that I have been much to blame, in not communicating earlier my information, respecting some of the matters here alluded to." Not therefore to any real man, avowing in any manner his name, title, style and dignities, as some individuals have a pleasure in doing, but to the mere Alphabetical H. M. M. as he exists on paper, I wish your readers at present to apply what I say. I am not contending with men, but books; not quarrelling with critics, but oversetting Critiques.

Despising as I do all anonymous writing, against or even about others, and knowing the tendency, which its habit must have, to lead gradually to a wide divergence from truth, by the relaxation of a consciousness of responsibility, and also to corrupt one's own feelings and principles, by cultivating a love of fault-finding, (both effects in exact proportion,) I did and will still follow my old honest and safe plan of avowing what I write; defying the first and second, with all future critics, or cavillers and accusers, nameless or nominate, to bear in this matter any true witness, to my discredit, or that of Mr. T. Connellan, before man. And here my dear Sir, let me kindly hint, that it is not right, in a Christian, or in any other, point of view, to publish accusations against me and others, such especially as in this latter article, without making our accusers give to the public, who are the jury, their names in full, and "*face to face*" with the accused. Let, however, your readers not cease to remember, that all the former or latter Critic's assertions of facts rest solely upon authority unknown to them, or only surmised. The public indeed, I believe, even without this hint, would not fail to appreciate the difference, between assertions made anonymously, or merely with initials, and denials with a name in full, having proofs affixed; even though knowing and caring nothing, about the relative characters of the accusing and accused.

To H. M. M. in his mere repetitions of the first Critic's censures, of course I will not tax your space, nor your readers' patience by replying, as I did before. Pages 629—634, too, only attack Mr. Owen Connellan, who seems to be dragged in maliciously, in order to injure him, and without any reason at all, as we had never mentioned his name, in the Circular, nor even alluded to him, in connection with the Irish Bible. He has already I see undertaken, in your pages, to defend himself, as he is well able, and has left the person, whom he asserts to be H. M. M. without excuse, for he must positively either prove his competency before the public, or before the tribunal proposed by Mr. Owen Connellan, or acknowledge his own incompetence, and "henceforth for ever hold his peace." I shall, therefore, give those pages only a few remarks, in my own manner.

I am aware, that Mr. T. Connellan's plan has always been, never to answer attacks upon him, but to follow the advice of Hezekiah to his servants, as to the railing Rabahakeh, in Isaiah xxxvi. 21. "But they held their peace, and answered him not a word; for the King's commandment was, saying, 'Answer him not.'" I know his plan has been also, when misrepresented or misunderstood, to leave it to time, to discover truth; and to defer to the season of GOD's judgment, all questions of injustice done him. But the former part of his plan cannot now be mine, and I know that

he has suffered severely, by following the latter so constantly. I think too, that no error, and no misrepresentation, should be left long unrefuted, or indeed allowed to pass current at all. Let nothing, however, that I say or do, be attributed as blame to him; I act for myself in these matters. My first reply he did not see, until it appeared in print, nor even know of its preparation, until it was finished; and for the present one also, I alone am responsible, both as to its manner and matter, value or defects.

O'Brien's Irish-English Dictionary, I called in the circular, and in your page 565, "very deficient;" adding, "*perhaps we shall find the very first word in it wrong,*" and contrary to all other published Dictionaries. H. M. M. replies, it is "*the well known*" work of "*a Roman Catholic Bishop,*" as if this were proof of its perfection; and adds, it "*has just been re-edited,*" he mentions not by whom; nor at present shall I, though in most things he deserves my praise. He then admits, that, "*although its very title, may have a letter in it too much;*" this proves not what I said, true," viz. that "*the want of a competent corrector of the press too, has made the above and almost all Irish Books, recently published or re-edited, by different Societies or individuals, exceedingly incorrect, as to typography, orthography, and even grammar.*" How do your readers think he excuses this? Truly by saying, this erroneous spelling has "*the authority of the Lexicographer himself,*" viz. O'Brien's. To me ("*a simple man,*" the former critic called me,) this proves O'Brien's neglect at least, to spell this Irish word correctly, and the re-editor's, and his subordinate corrector's equal inability, even to see the error. H. M. M. further justifies these modern blunders, in following an ancient one, by saying, it was "*owing, as I first thought, to the very un-Hibernian cut of the capitals, which might well have puzzled an Editor, in a page entirely composed of them.*" But how does this explain the original edition's error, when printed in Roman, not Irish, letters; or O'Brien's, in making the Autograph for the press? Or if he were not able to correct the proofs of his own printed work, could the re-editor or re-corrector neither perceive error in the book, from which they were reprinting, nor in their own "*Second edition revised and corrected?*" H. M. M. inserts as a parenthesis, "*(the type was invented by Mr. T. Connellan).*" Does he mean this to excuse all others from being able to read common print, or does he wish merely by it to throw reproach on him? Yet if really of so un-Hibernian a cut, why did the reprinters use them in the very title page? But the body of this reprint, which is executed by "*R. Graisberry,*" Printress to the University (T.C.D.) press, is printed with very ill cut types, got, I believe, from Dr. Edm. Fry, Type-founder, Type-street, Chiswell-street, London; not invented by Mr. T. C. but offered to him and refused, both before and after he got his own matrices cut, and his own type cast; and the matrices for Mrs. Graisberry's present types, used in the body of this work, were made, the types actually on sale, before ever Connellan visited England. Must we to please any one's bad taste, perpetuate all old malformations and reverently aged deformities, of the infancy of art, both in writing and in printing?

But H. M. M., like myself, is speaking of the title page, when he says, the "*page*" is "*entirely composed of*" "*Capital*" Letters, of a "*very un-Hibernian Cut.*" Now what is the fact? O'Brien's original Edition was wholly in English Letters, as is even stated in the preface to the new edition, at p. viii. "*O'Brien's Dictionary was printed throughout in the Roman Character; and Irish, English, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin words, were all written in the same Letter.*" Whoever prepared the Second for the press, must therefore have changed the Roman or English into Irish characters, and some one must have examined the proof-sheets also. But any person looking at the new Edition will find in its title page, but 29 lines and 203 words, of which but one line, (consisting of four words, or 29 letters,) is in Irish characters of any kind; and so far from these being

ill-formed, they are very pretty, neat and distinct. Before I conclude, I will prove at least twenty similar point-blank misstatements, as to plain facts, in H. M. M.'s paper. Let no person think after this, that I will take any of his assertions for granted, without examination. Any one comparing these letters, with those used in the body of the work, will think them very superior; but the latter, because ugly and ill-formed, H. M. M. I suppose, as he is always sneering at "Irish business," "Irish Critics," "Irish Scholars," and every thing "Irish," (I quote his words,) except himself, would compliment us by calling them "*very Hibernian*." The fact is, that the type used in Mr. T. C.'s works, which is that which appears in this reply, is in some letters more correct, in others a little ornamented, in all much better out, as any one may see, by a comparison, and it was all copied from various authentic manuscripts, inscriptions, seals, or coats of arms. But will H. M. M. please to explain, why the new Edition mistakes the letters of the same first word, on Page lviii. (or the 1st,) where what he would call capitals of a Hibernian cut are used? Or why is the third word spelled differently, in the two different places, viz. SAGS and SACS; although O'Brien's own Edition spelled it, in one way in both places, viz. on the Title page and on page 1? This Book is numbered "Q. R. 40" in T. C. D. Library. I wish to enable all to examine the truth of what I assert.

To O'Brien's re-editor, the *** ***** **, the public will agree with me, in thinking us deeply indebted. His was a generous liberality, in getting one of the best published Irish Dictionaries reprinted, chiefly I believe at his own expense; thus providing for its sale at a greatly reduced price, as H. M. M. asserts, "*a book of 12s. for 3 shillings to the Poor*." Let nothing said here be interpreted, as the slightest censure on him, in *this matter*. I regret his not procuring more competent assistance, and still more the work's not being *corrected and improved*, enlarged by additional words, and fortified by more quotations and authorities. Not knowing Irish himself, I believe, he probably thought the corrector of the press, whom he employed, fully competent. But though H. M. M. "*feels assured that the book is fully adequate to answer every spiritual purpose, required of it*," I think, that a Lexicon has other requisites, besides spiritual uses, one of which is correctness; and surely an upright and pious re-editor would deeply regret that his non-corrector had left "*Reatoipe, Reatoipe*;" "*Reataire or Reatoire*; which word means, "*a female, of a character the direct reverse of what a clergyman should be*," for the word, which was probably intended, and which means "*a churchman, a rector*," "*a clergyman, a clerk*." (See the above words in the New Edition, or in page 399, and Second Column, of O'Brien's own Edition, in Roman letters. O'Reilly's dictionary has the same error.) But this is only a sample of numerous errors and mistakes, some of the most striking of which, if no one else does it, I shall probably at some future time point out. The mis-reprinter, and his corrector of the New Edition of O'Brien, have almost uniformly misplaced the accents over the Vowels, when two occur together; so that any one, taught to pronounce exactly by this dictionary, would, if reading or speaking, not be intelligible to the Poor at all.

But the above matters import little. I now come to the essential part of the paper. H. M. M. asserts, as to the word "Aithrige," "*that the rendering of penance has been added to its signification, in one modern Irish Dictionary, manifestly to favour the Doctrines of the Church of Rome*," but he carefully conceals, whose that dictionary is. Will your readers credit me, when I inform them, that it is the "*Irish-English Dictionary*," (in quarto,) "*published in 1817, in Dublin*," by "*Edward O'Reilly*," the very man, alone entrusted, as H. M. M. boasts, by his advice, with re-editing the Irish Bible's late Pocket Edition, he himself undertaking to be a supervisor over him? Look in that work, for many years, and even still, the principal vernacular Dictionary used in Ireland, and to which almost

alone the Four have had access; and see, in page 17, second column, the eighth and sixth words: (O'Reilly's Dictionary is numbered "Q. cc. 37." in T. C. D. Library.) viz:

"*Aithrige*, *aithrige*, see *Aithrige*." Having thus referred the reader, from "*aithrige*," the 8th word, to "*aithridge*," the 6th, he explains all the meanings of both, under "*aithridge*," together, as follows:—

"*Aithrige*, *aithridge*; a. f. PENANCE, repentance, tears, sadness, grief."

But H.M.M. said, "the word used in our proposed Edition, for '*Repentance*,' is so rendered, in the standard Dictionaries, viz. Bullet's *Dictionnaire Celtique*, Liuyd's, Shaw's, and the Gaelic Dictionary, lately published by the Highland Society." Why he omitted, among the "*standards*," O'Brien's, "*the well known one of a Roman Catholic Bishop*," we shall see by and by. But what signifies it, if his statement were true, that "*in these it signifies 'repentance, tears, grief or sadness,' alone?*" Do the poor Irish ever see or hear of these Dictionaries? The first is of Celtic by a Frenchman,* and was published in French at Besançon, in three volumes Folio in 1754; and it is not to be found, even in Trinity College or in Patrick's library. The second is of "Latin and Celtic, Welsh, Armoric, Bas-Bretagne, Cornish, Manx, Gaelic and Irish," and was published at Oxford by a Welshman, in folio, in 1707; and it is to be found only in great public or private Libraries. The third is chiefly of the Scotch or Erse dialect of the Celtic, though professing to add all Irish words, and it was published in Quarto in London, in 1780, in two volumes, (it is bound, interleaved with blank pages, in seven volumes, in Trinity College Library,) and is not often met in this country. The fourth is of Scotch, (Gaelic or Erse), with English and Latin, and a little Irish, and it was published in two volumes Quarto in Scotland, by the Highland Society. It is manifest too, that the great price of all these works would put them out of the reach of the poor, even if they were as common as ballads. When did O'Reilly cease to be a *standard* with H. M. M.?

But is H. M. M.'s assertion, that all these Dictionaries do not give "*Penance*," as the meaning of "*aithrige*," true? Let us see: One is entitled the "*Galic (Gaelic) and English Dictionary*, containing all the words in the Scotch and Irish Dialects of the Celtic, that could be collected from the voice, and old books and MSS. by Rev. William Shaw, A.M. London 4to. 2 vols. 1780." But any one, examining the copy in T.C.D. Library, will find that it does not contain one half of our Irish words, some thousands of which are inserted, in MS. on the interleaved blank pages. It was formerly the property of "Dr. Clement Archer," who wrote the MS. additions, and it was "the gift of Rt. Hon. Thomas Pelham, 5th Feb. 1798," to T.C.D. Library. It is lettered "Q. d. 13—19." Let any one look, and he will find in the "*English and Galic (Gaelic)*" part, or the 2nd Vol. (the third part of which in T.C.D. Library is marked Vol. vii.) at p. 218. 1st Col.

"PENANCE; Penas, breith AITHRIGHE."

The first of these words looks, as if it had been only the Latin word "*poenas*;" the second means "*judgment, or sentence*;" and the third is the proper word, universally used in Ireland, for "*PENANCE*." It is also the very word, misused in the Irish Bible, for "*Repentance*." Did H. M. M. speak all the truth? Ought he to "*Do Penance*," or "*To Repent*?"

In the same Dictionary, Vol. vii. p. 218, 2nd Col. we find

"Penitence; <i>aithreachas, aithnealachd</i> ."	V. vi. p. 162, 1st Col.	"Impenitence; <i>neimhathrachas</i> ."
"Penitent; <i>aithreach, doilgiasach</i> ."		"Impenitent; <i>neimhathrach</i> ."

* In fact, I am not sure, whether there is any book, called Bullet's "*Dictionnaire Celtique*." John Reid's "*Bibliotheca Scoto-Celtica*," 1832, p. xi. mentions, "*Memoires sur la Langue Celtique*;" par J. B. Bullet, 3 Vols. Folio. Besançon, 1754," which, I suppose, is the work alluded to by H. M. M. Possibly it may contain a Dictionary, but I have not yet been able to see it.

† The word "*Repentance*," does not occur in this "*Galic (Gaelic) English*" part of Shaw's Dictionary at all! and consequently "*aithreachas*," and "*aithnealachd*," or "*aithreachas* and "*aithnealachd*," which occur under "*Penitence*" and "*to Repent*," are the words, by which he would prefer to express "*Repentance*," and not "*Aithrige*," as H. M. M. asserts; but which Shaw says means "*Penance*" and not "*Repentance, tears, grief, or sadness, alone*" as H. M. M. pretended he said.

Vol. vii. p. 345, 1st Col. "To repent: Deanam athreachas, bhith aithmhealach," and not "deanam aithrige," as H. M. M. would persuade us. But H. M. M. was perhaps pleased only to look at the "Galic (Gaelic)-English" part, where I find in Vol. i. p. 14, 2nd Col. & p. 15, 1st. Col. what he possibly thought served his argument. viz;

"Aithmheal; Compunction, repentance."

"Aithreach; Penitent, sorry."

"Aithreachas; Repentance, regret."

"Aithridhe; Tears, grief, sadness, repentance."

"Aithridhach; Sorrowful."

It is easy to make others see only what he likes, if he make them look only where he pleases. But even as to this part, his statement is incorrect; for it is "aithridhe," and not "aithrige," that is stated to be "Tears, &c. &c." And the other spelling, viz. "aithrige," does not occur at all in this page of the Dictionary. Observe, too, that "Repentance" is put as its *last* meaning, not its *first*, as H. M. M. misquoted it.

I find also the same facts, in the only "English-Irish Dictionary," of any size, ever published, (except mere Vocabularies), viz. that by "Hugh M'Curtin, Paris, 4to. 1732," containing 717 pages, and lettered in T.C.D. Library, "Q. ee. 29," in which "Penance" is marked "aithrige;" while "Repentance" is expressed by "aithmhealach" and by "aithmhealach," under the noun "Penitence," and under the verb "To repent," as follows:—

P. 531, 2nd Col. "Penance; breac aithrige."

P. 532, 1st Col. "Penitence; s. Aithrige aithmhealach."

"Penitent; adj. Aithrigeach, doilgiorach fan coir do ríde."

"Penitential; s. Teabair do treorúgear an eazlwr éim breac aithrige do éir do réir na coirne úd an t-íomhach."

P. 576, 2nd Col. "To repent, v.n. do beir aithmhealach. He does not at all repent; Ní tuis ré aithmhealach an aoncor."

P. 345, 1st Col. "Impenitence, s. Meamaitrige cruad éirídear."

"Impenitent, adj. Mac éirídear aithrige."

Look now in the Highland Society's Gaelic Dictionary, called "Dictionarium Scoto-Celticum, or a Dictionary of the Gaelic," (with English and Latin,) "Language, compiled and published under the direction of the Highland Society of Scotland," in 2 vols. 4to. 1828, (lettered in T.C.D. Library "Q. d. 41, 42,") and see as follows, in Vol. I:—

P. 37, 1st Col.—"Aithre, s. m. ind. Repentance: Penitentia. "Aithre chum na beatha." *Gaelic Catechism*; "Repentance unto life." "Penitentia in vitam (eternam)." *Vide* Aithreachas."

"Aithreach-eiche, adj. (Aithre) Penitent, sorry; Penitens, Dolens." "S aithreach leinn"; C. 8. "We are sorry," "Penitet nos;" "B' aithreach leis an Tighearna;" *Genesis* vi. 6. "It repented the Lord." "Penituit Jehovah."

"Aithreachail, a. adj. (Aithreach) Penitent; Penitens. *Macf. V. id. q. Aithreach, adj.*"

2d Col. "Aithreachan, ain, an; s. m. (Aithreachas) A penitent. Penitens, *Macf. V.*"

"Aithreachas, ais; s. m.; Repentance, Penitentia, Re-piscentia. "S amaidach a bhicuir a mach aigrid a cheannach aithreachas." *Proverb*; "It is foolish to expend money, on the purchasing of repentance." "Insipiens est pecuniam largiri, ad penitentiam emendam." *MANX. Arrya.* (See page 15 of this Reply, last line but one.)

"Aithri, s. m. A. *M'D. 131. 193.* Vide Aithreachas."

"Aithridhe, s. f. Fears, (Tears?) griefs, sadness, repentance; Lachrymæ, Dolores, Tristitia, Penitentia, &c."

"Aithridheach, adj. (Aithridhe), Sorrowful; Penitens, Mœstus. *Urn. 31.*"

P. 932, 1st Col. "Penitentia; s. Aithreachas"

"Penitens; part. Aithreachail; aithreach;"

"Peniteo,—cre: v.n.

P. 973, 2nd Col. "Resipisco,—cre: v.n. } Deam aithreachas; Gabh aithreachas;"

Page 690, 1st Column.

"Penance; s. Pearas; cronachadh; féin—dhioladh; aithreachas;" (See note on next page.)

* The Irish type, selected by the Highland Society, for this work, is exactly like, if not identical with Mr. T. Connellan's own font, which H. M. M. calls so very un-Hibernian!!

+ All the modern Protestant Gaelic Catechisms have "Aithreachas chum na beatha." The old ones, it appears, had, like our Popish Catechisms, the ambiguous "Aithre," which is now expunged, probably because Papist Highlanders used "Aithre" for "Penance."

2nd column.

- "Penitence; } s. Aithreachas, aithre, dolghios, bròn ;"
- "Penitency; }
- "Penitent; adj. Aithreachail, aithreach, dultich, brùite, tairseach ;"
- "Penitent; s. Aithreach. aithreachan, iompachan ;"
- "Penitential; adj. Aithreachail ;"
- "Penitentiary; s. l. A penitent; Aithreachan; The place where Penance is enjoined; ionadh-aithreachais; (See the Note + below on this page.)"
- "Penitentiary; adj. Aithreachail ;"
- "Penitently; adv. See Penitent adj."

p. 737, 1st column

- "Repent; v. act a. l. Remember with sorrow—Dean aithreachas, Gabh aithreachas ;
- "2. Think on any thing past with sorrow, Gabh aithreachas ; Bi aithreachail ;"
- "Repentance; s. Aithreachas, ngartas coguis ;"
- "Repentant; adj. Aithreachail, dultich, cràiteach ;"
- "Repentant; } s. Aithreachan."
- "Repenter; }
- "Repentingly; adj. Gu h-aithreachail ;"

p. 574, column 1.

- "Impenitence; } s. Neo-aithreachas; cruas—cridhe; neo—mhothalachd ;"
- "Impenitency; }
- "Impenitent; adj. Neo-aithreachail; cruaid-cridheach, neo—mhothacaid ;"
- "Impenitent; s. Neo-aithreachan ;"
- "Impenitently; adv. See Impenitent, adj."

p. 828, col. 1.

- "Unrepented; adj. —Neo aithreach, —neo-aithreachail ;"

It is obvious, that here the spelling "aithrige" does not occur at all, and that it is of "aithridhe," as merely copied from "SÀ." or "Shaw's Dictionary," that the meaning "Tears, &c." with "Repentance" *last*, is given; and that this word too is marked with a star, as obsolete or not fit for use; and also, that another word is explained by "Repentance," first and alone, viz. "Aithreachas," and that "To Repent" is never translated "Dean aithrige," as H. M. M. asserts; but always either "Dean aithreachas," or "Gabh aithreachas." Gaelic Bibles and Catechisms now too always use "aithreachas" for "Repentance" and never either "aithrige," "aithridhe," "aithre," or "aithri," all which words, or spellings, they reject totally. I am perfectly aware, that in Manuscripts, we find the words, *Àithrige* and *Àithridhe*, often interchanged the first for the second, and *vice versa*; but in the Irish New Testament, the former of these is never used, and probably I should find the same the fact, as to the old Testament, had I time to look; so that unhappily, what H. M. M. asserts, as to the word actually used, viz. *aithrige*, is totally contrary to fact, in this and in all the *standard* Dictionaries, that I have as yet quoted, as referred to by him. But I will examine others not mentioned by him.

In the "English and Gaelic Vocabulary," Edinburgh, 1815, 8vo. p. 226, by "P. Mac Farlane" ("Translator of Doddridge's Rise and Progress, Blair's Sermons, and Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, &c. &c. into Gaelic") we find, p. 113. Col. 2. "Impenitence; s. Neo-aithreachail."

"Impenitent; adj. Neo-aithreach."

Impenitently; ad. Gu neo aithreachail.

p. 153, Col. 1. "Penance; s. Réite, dloladh, peanas."*

p. 174. Col. 2. "Repent; v. Gabh aithreachas."

"Repentance; s. Aithreachas."

This book is numbered "O. i. 71," in T.C.D. Library.

In the "Gaelic Dictionary, by the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod, of Campsie, and Rev. Dr. Daniel Dewar of Glasgow," Glasgow 1831, p. 1005, (lettered "SS. g. 26." in T.C.D. Library,) we find—

p. 18, Col. 1. "Aithre, s. m. *ind.* Repentance."†

"Aithreach-eiche; adj. Penitent, sorry."

"Aithreachail; adj. Penitent, Repentant."

"Aithreachan-sin-an; s. A Penitent."

"Aithreachas, s. m. Repentance, Penitence."

"Aithreachag-aig; s. f. A female Penitent."

"Aithri, s. m. See Aithreachas."

* It is remarkable, that this and the next, both eminent dictionaries, reject the opinion of the Highland Society's Dictionary, that "aithreachas" is ever properly used for "Penance," so that it is probably never, or but very rarely so mis-used; and then only by a perversion of its meaning, as in the abuse of the word "Penitencia."

† See Note + in Page 6.

- p. 979, Col. 1. "Unrepentant; *adj.* neo-aithreach; Neo-bhrònach;"
 p. 789, Col. 1. "Impenitence; } s. Neo-aithreachas; cruas oridhe;"
 "Impenitency; }
 "Impenitent; *adj.* Neo-aithreachail; neo-mhothachail."
 p. 860, Col. 1. "Penance; s. Peanas, péin-dhioladh." (See Note † on p. 7.)
 p. 898, Col. 1. "Repent; v. n. & a. Gabh aithreachas; dean aithreachas;
 bi aithreachail."
 "Repentance; s. Aithreachas; agartas coguis."
 "Repentant; *adj.* Aithreachail; lan aithreachais; brònach;
 duilich."

But, perhaps, H. M. M. at least quotes Lhuyd correctly, though writing his name wrong, (Lluyd). Not quite correctly! His great work is called, "Archæologia Britannica, giving some account, additional to what has been hitherto published, of the languages, histories and customs of the original inhabitants of Great Britain; from collections and observations, in travels through Wales, Cornwall, Bas-Bretagne, Ireland and Scotland; by Edward Lhuyd, M.A. of Jesus College, Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, in Oxford. Vol. I. Glossography, Oxford, M.DCC.VII." Folio.

Look into the "Irish-English Dictionary" in this work, and see, not "aithrige," but "*Aithreachas*," and one, two, or three other words for "Repentance," and not any other meaning given; neither "tears, grief, or sadness;" nor "*agitation of mind, or dismay*," as H. M. M. asserts.

"Aithreach, Aithreachas, and Aithreachus; *Repentance*;
 Na haithrídh; of *Repentance*. St."

It is obvious, that *Na hAithridh* is here meant for the genitive of the word "aithridhe". But this is the word, that is in that part of the Dictionary, and "*aithrige*," contrary to H. M. M.'s assertion, does not occur at all. Yet when we turn to the previous parts, viz. the "Latin & Celtic, Welsh, Armorican, Cornish, Irish and Gaelic Dictionaries," we find, that for "*Pœnitentia*," which, in Latin, like all the words, by which they translate it into every other tongue, is used by all Romanists, to mean both "*Repentance*" and "*Penance*,"

he does indeed set down the very word *Aithrige*, spelled "aithrige," by which H. M. M. and O'Reilly have been teaching our people "*Penance*," as a part of "*Repentance*," contrary to H. M. M.'s duty, and to his positive statement to the Edinburgh Bible Society's Committee, as repeated in his critique. See Lhuyd's "Archæologia, &c. &c." at

Page 122, 3rd Col. "*Pœnitentia*; *Repentance*, an *after sorrow*, also *dislike or slighting*; (Irish) *Aithrige*; *aithreachas*; *kroidhe avrudhadh*; *†caita*; *kýngain xroidhe*; no *toirre xroidhe*."

"*Pœnitet*; *To repent, to grieve*; *to be ashamed of*, &c. (Irish) *As aithreach*; as *doilidh*; as *doilcheas*; as *olk (olk?)*; as *†nár*; as *avalta*; as *naireach*; as *kraidhte leir*; do *gaillidh ar*; *ata aithreachas ar*; *ata naire no avaltas ar*."

Hence alone, I believe, it was, that as Lhuyd knew, that "*Pœnitentia*" was abused by Papists, to mean "*Penance*" as well as "*Repentance*,"* he does not put the word "*Penance*" in this Dictionary at all; especially as the Welsh, of whose tongue he chiefly wrote, are all Protestants.

Lhuyd's Archæologia, in T.C.D. Library is marked "GG. bb. 24." It contains ten parts or titles. Title X is "An Irish-English Dictionary" In it he mentions in page 311, Section I. that the Old Testament was not translated by Bishop Bedell, but by Friar King, at his desire; but to this matter I shall recur hereafter, if permitted. I would merely enquire at present, could the word, "*Aithreachas*" "*Repentance*," be derived from "*aith, after*, and *reacht, right*," meaning "returning afterwards to a right mind," which is almost exactly the meaning of "*παραίεσις*?" Lhuyd does not give the word "*Impenitence*" at all, I believe. Under the

* I shall shew, just now, that Lhuyd copied from Plunkett's MS. Roman Catholic Latin and Irish Dictionary, which proves what is said above, as to "*Pœnitentia*," "*Penance*," "*Aithrige*." And as O'Brien's Title page (first Edition) states, that he "*particularly*" "*compiled*" from the Vocabulary of "*Mr. Edward Lhuyd*," we see at once, why his Dictionary too happens not to have the word for "*penance*" viz: "*aithrige*" at all in it.

word "Aithmheal," he gives as one example, "bhl me a nAithmheal," "I was dismayed;" but in no instance have I found "aithreachas" ever translated "dismay or agitation of mind," as H. M. M. would imply. The words "Breath, and Breitheamhnus" too, which are sometimes prefixed to "aithrige" in Ireland, when they must express "the particular Penance adjudged," Lhuyd marks as "judgment" or "sentence." Under the words "Resipiscencia" and "Resipisco," it is observable, that Lhuyd puts "aithreachas" first, for the former, and that for the latter he forms the verb "aithrighim." Thus in "Title 11, or A Comparative vocabulary," p. 139, 2nd & 3rd Col. we find, "Resipiscencia; Repentance; (Irish;) Aithreachas, aithrigh."

"Resipisoo; to Repent; to return to a right understanding; to come to his wits or senses again;—(Irish;) Aithrighim; ata aithreachas oram; as aithreachas hom."

The Manuscript Dictionary, among Trinity College Library MSS., which is marked "Lexicon Lat. Hibern. H. 37," is called "An Extract from Plunkett's Latin and Irish Dictionary," or "Vocabularium Latinum et Hibernicum." It was formerly in the possession of Edward Lhuyd, as is shewn by his Autograph in it, signed thus "Edw. Lhuyd." And it

proves what is stated above, if we only remember, that it was composed by a Papist, and that they use "Pœnitentia," much more commonly as meaning "Penance" than "Repentance." This Dictionary has no Irish and Latin part I believe; nor any English words, nor an English and Irish part, at all; Irish and English letters, however, are mixed in the words. I shall put all in the latter.

"Pœnitentia, f. g. aithrige; aithreachus; croidhe abhrudhadh; croidhe breoghadh; ealta; ma congain chroidhe; no toirse chroidhe."

"Pœnitet, impera. as aithreach; as doilidh; as doilheachach; as oic; as nar; mo as amhalta; as naireach; no as craidhte leir; do gallidh ar; ta aithreachas ar; ta naire no amhaltas ar."

Lhuyd refers to this very Book, in his preface, page iv. Title X. "In Ireland The Most Reverend Father in God, Narcissus, Lord Primate of Armagh, was pleased to communicate a Latin-Irish Foclóir (or Vocabulary) written about fifty years since, by Richard Plunkett, a Franciscan of the Abbey of Trim, a person of laudable industry, and as seemed to me, (for I ought herein to submit to the opinions of the natives,) a judicious writer. The great use that manuscript has been of, is particularly mentioned, in the preface to the Irish Dictionary. For though it be true, that I had written and begun printing that part, before my receiving the Vocabulary; yet the progress of the printer, on account of other business in hand, was so slow, that besides its use in the Comparative Vocabulary, it gave me time enough, to insert therein what additions seemed necessary to the design "proposed." In this part of the Dictionary, as in O'Brien's who copied from Lhuyd, we find "+ Ealta Repentance." The cross before the word indicating "obsolete". See "Title 11. p. 41." See also page 312, in "Title X." or "Foclóir Gaoidheilge Shagsonach no Bearla-doir Scott-Sagsamhuil"; or an "Irish-English Dictionary." Any one may see, that Lhuyd copied Plunkett verbatim, though sometimes incorrectly as to letters.

Plunkett's Dictionary, at Marsh's Library, is lettered "Plunkett's Latin and Hib. Dictionary; MSS." and is numbered in the shelves and in the MSS catalogues, "Class V. 3; Table 2, No. 5." Inside it is entitled "Vocabularium Latinum et Hibernicum;" or "FOCLÓIR LÁ-
TINE (TUINNDE) 7 (UGAS) GUAIDHEILGE (GU-
ODHEILGE) ar na rchíobad na bnaeair boce dond. S.
FHOILSÍU, adon RÍOGEARD Fluinead amairt-
zeir baile úta tpoim.

"Pœnitendus, a. ū; *neḡ aḡḡḡ; no ḡḡaḡḡḡ;*"

"Pœnitens, aḡḡḡḡ; aḡḡḡ; aḡ aḡḡḡ; aḡ ḡḡ aḡḡḡ;
ḡḡḡ no ḡḡḡ aḡḡḡ."

"Pœnitentia, *f. g.* aḡḡḡ, aḡḡḡaḡ, cḡḡḡḡ ḡḡḡḡḡ;
cḡḡḡḡ ḡḡḡḡḡ; eacḡa; ḡḡ cḡḡḡḡḡ cḡḡḡḡ;
no cḡḡḡḡ cḡḡḡḡ; *ḡḡ cḡḡḡḡḡ; vid. Contempt.*"

"Pœnitet, *impers.* aḡ aḡḡḡ; aḡ ḡḡḡḡ; aḡ ḡḡḡḡaḡ; aḡ
olc; aḡ ḡḡḡ; ḡḡ aḡ ḡḡḡḡ; aḡ ḡḡḡḡ; no
aḡ cḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ; ḡḡ ḡḡḡḡḡ aḡ; cḡ aḡḡḡḡaḡ
aḡ; cḡ ḡḡḡḡ no ḡḡḡḡaḡ aḡ; cḡ ḡḡḡḡḡ;
ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ; no cḡḡḡḡ aḡ aḡ; ḡḡ ḡḡḡḡḡḡ
ḡḡḡ ḡḡḡ ḡḡḡḡḡ; ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ; ḡḡ ḡḡḡḡ
ḡḡḡ no ḡḡḡḡ aḡ; cḡ cḡḡḡḡḡḡ aḡḡḡ aḡ."

"Pœnitudo, *idem q. Pœnitentia.*"

"Impœnitendus, a. ū; *neḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ.*"

"Impœnitens, *neḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ;*"

"Impœnitentia, *f. g.* *neḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ; neḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ.*"

Another MS Dictionary, in the MSS. Library of T.C.D. is marked "H. 13" and is entitled, "*An Irish-English Dictionary, written out fair, and which was intended to be printed, with a Prosody.*" This was one of those, I believe, from which O'Reilly borrowed a great deal. It proves the same point, viz. that "*ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ*," the word used in the Gaelic Bible, is a more proper word for "*Repentance*," than "*aḡḡḡḡ.*" It contains the following words:—

"*ḡḡḡḡḡḡ, sorry*"

"*ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ, repentance, aḡḡḡḡ, i. leaḡḡḡḡ, i. ḡḡḡ.*"

"*ḡḡḡḡḡḡ, } { i. ḡḡḡḡ, i. eacḡa; tears, grief, sadness.*"

"*ḡḡḡḡḡḡ, } { repentance.*"

"*ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ, sorrowful.*"

"*ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ, sorrowfulness.*"

I have not yet, as said above, been able to get access to "*Bullet's Dict. Celtique*," but have little doubt, that when I do, I shall find, that H. M. M. has misrepresented it, as he has done, more or less, all the other Dictionaries, that contain Irish words, to which I have referred; of which only four however were mentioned by him.

In addition, I will give your readers a supplementary proof, from the celebrated Manuscript Latin, English and Irish Dictionary, in Marsh's Library at Patrick's Cathedral; numbered "Class V. 3. Tab. 1, No. 12," lettered on the back "*Walsh's Dict. Lat. Ang. et Hibern.*" Folio, and whose title is as follows:—

"*Dictionarium Latino-Anglo-Hibernicum, inchoatum et ad medium perductum, ab Reverendo admodum Patre, Francisco Walsh, Dublinensi, Ordinis Minorum, et Sacræ Theologiæ Doctore Jubilato, &c. absolutum vero Domino Thaddeo Neachtuin, vetustissimæ et purissimæ linguæ Hibernicæ professore; nunc autem illustrium quorundam virorum curâ et munificentia in lucem editum.*" Its Irish Title is. "*ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ ḡḡḡḡ ḡḡḡḡ ḡḡḡḡḡḡ.*" The Irish and Latin part does not appear to have been ever written. This Latin and Irish part is called "*ḡḡḡḡḡḡ ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ,*" or "*Prima pars, scil: Latino-Hibernicum.*" Its numerous quires of paper appear to have been copied out fairly, with a view to its publication, by ten or more eminent Irish Scholars, among whose names we meet Thaddeus

O'Neachtuin ; P. Naghten ; Hugh M'Curtin, &c. It ends with the word "Uraniscus."

In it they will find what I say, (as to all Roman Catholics confusedly using, in their Dictionaries, the same word for "*Repentance*," that properly among them means "*Penance*," and *vice versé*, thus either degrading "*Repentance*" into "*Penance*," or exalting the latter into the former,) proved, as follows:—

[illegible]

“*Pœnitentiarius*, ii. m. *A Penitentiary, or Confessor; Item a Penitent man*: oide *FAÖHILDE: AĖAIN FAÖHILIN: Item AĖENIZĖEAC.*”

^a Poeniteo, ere; *To Repent, to grieve*; ἀἵνεαῆαρ; no δόλιχῆρε; no δόλιχῶρ do beῖτε; no do ἱλάεσθ; do ἱστῆεσθ ἀρ.'

"Poenitet; *impers. It repents, it grieves, to be ashamed of*; ԳՐ ՎԻՐԵԱԾ; ԳՐ ԾՈՒԼԻԾ; ԳՐ ԾՈՒԼՅՈՐԱԾ; ԳՐ ՕԼԵ; ԳՐ ՏՈՒԼԱԵԱ; ՈՐ ԳՐ ՆԱՐԵԱԾ ԼԻՈՒ, ԼԵԱԵ, ԼԻՐ, ԴԵ; ՎԻՐԵԱԾԱՐ; ՆԱՐԵ; ՈՐ ՏՈՒԼԱԵԱՐ ԾՈ ԵՐԵՒ ՎԻՐ:"

"Poenitudo, inis; *f. V. Pœnitentia.*"

"Impoenitens, atis; *Impenitent;*" "դեմալտրիշեաճ; անօրհնեաճ."

“Impoenitentia, *u. f.* Impenitence; րեւոյժութիւն : անճշմարտութիւն.”

“Resipiscentia, æ. f. *Repentance*—ⲁⲓⲧⲛⲉⲁⲥⲩⲣ: ⲁⲓⲧⲛⲓⲧ:”

“Resipisco, etc. To repent, to amend, to come to oneself again—**ԾԱՆԻՔ-**
ԵԱԾ; **ԱՄԻՔԱՐ** ըօ **ԵՅԻ ՕՐԱՄ**; **ԱՐ** **ԱՄԻՔԱՐ** **ԼՈՄ**;
ՄԵ ԲԵՆ ըօ **ԼԵԱՐՆԱԾ**; ըօ **ՇԵԱՐ ՇՅԱՄ ԲԵՆ**.”

Your readers have already seen above, that Plunkett's, the other celebrated Manuscript Latin and Irish Dictionary, in Marsh's Library, confirms what I say, indisputably too, namely, that the word spelled "AITHISE" means "PENANCE;" and other Great Manuscript Dictionaries, in Trinity College Library,* will prove the same point also. But it is needless to quote every one, for I trust, that H.M.M. or any other individual, or body of men, will never again attempt to controvert the fact, that "AITHISE" in Ireland, is understood to mean "*Penance*," ninety-nine times, or even nine hundred and ninety-nine times, for every once, that our poor populace use it, or hear it used, to mean "*Repentance*." And even when used by them, or to them, to mean "*Repentance*," it does not imply, what we mean, by that word, but merely 1. "*Imperfect Contrition*;" or 2. "*Mere Attrition*;" or 3. a "*Resolution to amend*," and "*to make an Atonement for our sins*," or a "*Satisfaction, that is a Reparation of the injury offered to God*," by Austerities; or 4. &c. or 5. &c.

Thus "Donlevy's Irish and English Catechism," in pages 278—279, teaches. "Question."—"Is imperfect contrition, together with the Sacrament, of PENANCE, (na hîicirc;icirc;) sufficient for obtaining the Remission of our Sins?" "Answer."—"It is," &c.&c.!!! This is the doctrine, to which H. M. M. and O'Reilly's use of the word "hîicirc;icirc;," "Penance" in the Bible has been teaching the people to cling!!!

In that most celebrated ancient Manuscript, The English, Latin and Irish Dictionary, that was formerly among General Vallancey's Manuscripts, and is now in the Library of the Royal Irish Academy, we find the same fact proved, as to "*aithrige*." This work is called "The great Caise (Coishe) of Words," &c. "*Ḃair mór breitheir*," or "*Cais mór breithir*," or "*Caise mór*

See a Note as to the above Dictionaries and perhaps others, at the end of this paper.

bhreithr." A note signed by General Vallancey states, that it was "composed by a Schoolmaster at Ringsend,* about fifty years before;" And "the obsolete words are marked thus +." It is in 3 volumes folio.

"PENANCE; Penitentia; *Hibernice*, Aithrige; *Hibernice* aithreachas; croidhe—avrath; caongain—croidhe; toirshe—croidhe; + calta, i. repentance.

breath,
breathavnus, } aithrige; i. the penance imposed."

"TO DO PENANCE—*Latine*, Agere Penitentiam.
HIBERNICE,

nim { aithrige; aithreachas;	as aithreach liom;	as { aithrige aithreachas croidhe—avrath toirshe croidhe	} oram;	coivilionam covalliam glacam oram	} breathavnus aithrige;
---------------------------------	--------------------	---	---------	---	----------------------------

"PENITENCE OR PENANCE; Penitentia; *Hibernice*, aithrige, aithreachas, croidhe—avrath; + calta; caongain—croidhe; toirshe—croidhe."

"A PENITENT; *L.* Penitens, *Hib.* aithreach; aithrigeach; croidh—hairsheach; toir—hairsheach; doilghiosach san choir do rinne."

"TO BE PENITENT; *Lat.* Penitescere, *Pigeo*, Resipisco, Penitentiam agere; *Hibernice*."

as aithreach liom; nim aithreachas;	as doilidh as doilghiosach as oile as avalta as craidhte as nairreach	} liom;	gaillidh oram; ata { aithreachas nairre avalta	} oram;	aithrighim;"
--	--	---------	---	---------	--------------

"PENITENTIAL; *Lat.* Penitentiarius, pullatus, *Hib.* aithrige a vuill; aithreach; eageasineach; doilghiosach; dobronach; toirsheach; croidhe avrudach; croidhe hairsheach."

"A PENITENTIARY, or Priest antiently appointed to hear confessions, *Lat.* Penitentiarius, *Hib.*

athair faoiseadain; } athair faoiseadain } einlighte—ee;
coineasoir

mollod chum faoiseadain d'eisdeachd;"

"PENITENTLY; *Lat.* Penitenter; *Hib.* go hairsheach; go hairsheach; go doilghiosach; go dobronach; go heageasineach."

"TO REPENT; *Lat.* Penitescere, Resipisco, Penitentiam agere; *Hib.*

ithvealam; M'C.	ata { aithreachas doilghios nairre avalta	} oram;	as { aithreach doilidh doilghiosach oile avalta nairreach craidhte	} liom;	nim { aithreachas doilghios	} ulme;	mairgnihim tuirsighim } sam'choir;
--------------------	--	---------	--	---------	--------------------------------	---------	---------------------------------------

Eng. I begin to repent of what I had said;
Lat. Penitentiam agere sermonis mei cepti;
Hib. Ta hairsheach liom mo ghlothaigh;
Do bhl aithreachas oram sam'chain;

Eng. I do not at all repent of it;
Lat. Haud muto factum;
Hib. Nl hairsheach liom é ar anchor;
Nil doilghios ar bith oram ulme;
Ni aithvealam ar anchor;

Eng. It repenteth me; *Lat.* Penitet; *Hib.* as { nairreach
aithreach
avalta
craidhte
oile
doilghiosach

"REPENTANCE *Lat.* Penitentia; Contritio; Resipiscencia, *Hib.* aithrige; aithreachas; croidhe—avrath; caongain croidhe; toirshe croidhe; + calta; croidheavgar; croid—bherran; cov—mbruidheach;"

"REPENTANT; *Lat.* Penitens, *Hib.* ag deanadh aithreachas;

"REPENTING; lán d' aithreachas; aithreach; croidhe—hairsheach; croidhe—avrach;"

"REPENTINGLY; *Lat.* contrite; *Hib.* go hairsheach; go croid—hairsheach; go croidhe—avrach; go croidhe avgarach; go croidhe bherranach; go cov—mbruidheach;"

"IMPENITENCE; *Latine*, Impenitentia; *Hibernice*, neav-aithrige; neav—aithreachas; cruadh—croidheach; cruas—croidhe; dith aithreachais "

"IMPENITENT; *Lat.* Impenitens; *Hibernice*, neav-aithreach; cruadh—croidheach; neav—hairsheach fa pheaca; nach deanam aithrige."

"UNREPENTANT; *Lat.* In delicto contumax; In accleris perseverentia obstinatus;
Hib. neav—aithreach; gan—aithreachas; { eas—uval
neav—urramach
ceinn trean
seas vach

} na choir;
na chiontas,
na lochd,
na lochd aighil,
na vioghraas."

* I believe he was a person of the name of Crabb.

Does not the word "*aithrige*," meaning "*Penance*," as distinguished from the Protestant meaning of "*Repentance*," which the Gaelic Bible expresses always by "*aithreachas*," occur in the following and numerous other Irish Manuscripts, mentioned in O'Reilly's own manuscript copy of the printed and manuscript Irish works, in his Library, which Catalogue is now, with many of his books, in the possession of the Royal Irish Academy, P. 235, No. 142, viii. P. 271, No. 159, v. P. 279, No. 167, &c. &c. &c.

I would ask therefore, now, these questions: Was not O'Reilly a Romanist until death? Is "*aithrige*'s" very first meaning, in HIS Dictionary, "*PENANCE*?" Was it not H. M. M. and the Irish Society, who spent large sums, in purchasing many copies of it? Did not they, by his advice, circulate them, among their Masters and most advanced Scholars, giving them as grants, presents, rewards to some, selling them at reduced prices to others? Will he disprove the Society's minutes of 5th September, 1823, when £50 was ordered to be expended on O'Reilly's Dictionaries, at 12s. each; and 19th Sep. 1823, when 100 copies were purchased at a reasonable rate; or 7th May, 1824, 24 copies at 16s. 3d; and 6th June, 1824, 12 copies at 18s., if not to be got at 16s. 3d. &c. &c. But it is needless tracing a list of all purchases, even up to, or I believe after O'Reilly's death, about two years ago; and as needless to copy orders for grants, presents and sales, to Superintendants, Inspectors, Schoolmasters and Scholars. However, observe, that these very O'Reilly's Dictionaries, marking "*Aithrige*" as "*PENANCE*," are those, which, by the Kingscourt Masters' and Scholars' Resolution, as half-quoted by H. M. M. they had in their hands, when comparing the Irish version with the Rheinish and Protestant English Testaments, they found the Irish one "*throughout, most agreeing with our own Rheinish Version*,"* of course. (See the whole in Chr. Exam. Vol. ii. p. 324.)

If, as H. M. M. asserts, O'Reilly put "*PENANCE*," as the "*signification*" of "*Aithrige*," (not "*added*" it, as H. M. M. states, or put it last, as a supplementary or derivative meaning, but prefixed it, and put it first, as radical and primary,) "*manifestly to favour*" Popish errors, why retained H. M. M. it, in the Bible, printed under his own superintendence, so as to perpetuate that support? Why left his chosen re-editor, this identical O'Reilly, it there, except to favour them and extend it? Why circulated the Irish Society, Bibles, with "*Aithrige*" in them, along with O'Reilly's Dictionary, fixing "*aithrige*," as "*PENANCE*?" Was it H. M. M.'s ignorance, or wilfulness? O'Reilly acted consistently, and with knowledge.

I have already copied O'Reilly's Dictionary, as to *איִתְרִיגֶה* & *איִתְרִיבֶה*; let us now examine the other words allied to these, for I sincerely wish, to help every man's mind to think justly.

p. 17, Col. 1.—"*איִתְרִיבֶה*, *aithmheal*, s. repentance."

"*איִתְרִיבֶה*, *aithmheala*, s. compunction, penitence, sorrow."

"*איִתְרִיבֶה*, *aithmhealach*, adj. penitent, sorrowful."

"*איִתְרֶה*, *aithreach*, adj. penitent, compunctive, sorry."

"*איִתְרֶה*, *aithreachas*, s. m. repentance, compunction."

Col. 2.—"*איִתְרֶה*, *aithreadh*, s. repentance, sorrow, compunction."

"*איִתְרֶה*, *aithreas*, s. repentance, compunction;

זאבאיִתְרֶה, *aithreagh*, I repent."

"*איִתְרִיבֶה*, *aithridheach*, } adj. penitent, sorrowful."

"*איִתְרִיגֶה*, *aithrigheach*, }

"*איִתְרִיגֶה*, *aithriseach*, adj. contrite."

* These words are wholly left out of the very centre of H. M. M.'s quotation of this Resolution, by which means he makes it prove his argument!!! Where are truth and honesty gone? That these words were intentionally left out, is proved by the fact, that with them the Resolution proves my argument; without them, it appears to support H. M. M.'s argument; and that the Resolution was not only furnished in 1826 to the Christian Examiner at full length, as above stated, but was published in 1829, in a book called "*Reasons, Authorities and Facts*," &c. "respecting the duty of employing the Irish Language, &c. &c. by Henry J. Monck Mason, *L.L.D.* Secretary to the Irish Society." See p. 22, 11th and 12th lines from the bottom. Can H. M. M. have forgotten this book's existence, as much as the public have.

It is here manifest, that five words are marked "Repentance" or "Penitence," viz: "Ἀἰτnehal, Ἀἰτnehala, Ἀἰτneacaf, Ἀἰτnead, and Ἀἰτneaf"; and that "I repent," is translated by "ἡβαῖον Ἀἰτneaf," and not by "δεῖναῖον Ἀἰτνῖζε," which means "I do penance;" for I have above proved already, that O'Reilly gives "Ἀἰτνῖδε and Ἀἰτνῖζε," alone, with "PENANCE" as their first meaning.

The same notorious fact was proved, long ago, by the short "English-Irish Dictionary" (or Vocabulary) "for the use of Schools, containing upwards of 8000 English words, with the corresponding Irish explanation," (Printed by Graisberry and Campbell, Dublin, 1814; 12mo. p. 145,) by Mr. T. Connellan; which shews, that to try now to introduce a distinction between the Papal Irish word, when it is used for "Penance" or for "Repentance," or "Penitence" is visionary. He put as the first Irish word, used for the former, "bneac," and as the second "Ἀἰτνῖζε"; and as one of the Irish words, employed for the two latter, "Ἀἰτνῖδε" or "Ἀἰτνῖζε," which O'Reilly, as we have seen above, says mean the same. As the word, therefore, which Popery has incurably affixed to "Penance," Mr. C. put "Ἀἰτνῖζε." The second word, that he put for "Repentance," is "eacfab," and the second, that he printed for "Penitence" is "Ἀἰτnehala." "Penitent" is marked "δοῖνῖοραc, Ἀἰτνῖδεac," and "Impenitence" on p. 52, 2nd col. "neamἈἰτνῖζε."

All these facts prove, that now any attempted separation of Ἀἰτνῖζε to mean "Repentance" alone, cannot succeed, for Ἀἰτνῖζε is irrevocably tied up, by Popery in Ireland, in the Papacized sense of "PENANCE"; and though "Ἀἰτνῖζε" is occasionally used in Papist conversations, as well as both "Ἀἰτνῖδε" and "Ἀἰτνῖδε" sometimes in Papist books and manuscripts, for "Penitence" or "Repentance," as for instance, once in the first line of p. 267 of Donlevy's Irish Catechism; yet it occurs there in the 7th line, and in hundreds and thousands of instances, in the sense of "Penance," for once that it is used for either of those words. Thus above I have shown the Reader, in the aforesaid Vocabulary, viz:—Mr. T. Connellan's Dictionary, that at page 79 1st. Col. and page 95, 2nd Col. it is observable, that "Ἀἰτνῖζε" is marked both "penance" and also "penitence," which has the same meaning exactly as "repentance." But Donlevy, in his Popish "Irish and English Catechism," pages xxxii. and xiii. proves clearly, that "Ἀἰτνῖζε," is the proper word for "Penance;" for he translates, "of the Sacrament of Penance" by "hSacramente na hἈἰτνῖζε," after having, but two lines before, translated, "of sincere Repentance," by "fiof-Ἀἰτneacaf."*

This puts beyond all dispute also, that "Ἀἰτneacaf," which is the word used in the Gaelic Bible, is a more proper translation of "Repentance," than "aithrige" can be, a Romanist himself, viz. Donlevy being the judge, between H. M. M. and myself. A Protestant too proves the same thing, for Mr. T. Connellan, in his Vocabularies and Spelling books published in London, puts among the trissyllable nouns "Ἀἰτneacaf" "repentance."

But this matter imports too much, to rest even here. Look at the Greek Testament, and it's various translations. Are not the following, the words used. I have only consulted a few works, but could easily swell this table to five times this size, with the same result, if I inserted all the translations of "μετάνοιαν," in Matt. iii. 2, &c. &c. mentioned in various Versions and Commentators, Editions and Paraphrases—

* All the modern Gaelic Protestant Catechisms, for example Willison's "Leabhar Chríst na Mathar, &c." at p. 28 express, "What is sincere repentance?" by "Clod e fíor aithreachas?" Donlevy's very words. This proves "aithreachas" preferable to the ambiguous Popish "aithre."

True and False Translations of *Metanoia*, in Matt. iii. 2, &c.

FIRST CLASS.

GREEK;	{ Original text ; Modern Version ;	<i>μετανοεῖτε.</i> <i>μετανοεῖτε.</i>
HEBREW;	{ Hutter's Version ; Greenfield's Edition ;	שובו ;
SYRIAC ;	{ Peschito Version ; one of the first ever made ;	תשובו ;
ÆTHIOPIC ;	{ The word means, Beza's Version ;	resipiscite ;
LATIN ;	{ Castalio's Version ; Tremellius's Version ;	corrigite ; convertimini ;
ITALIAN ;	{ De La Haye ; Diodati's Version ;	penitemini ; ravvedetevi ;
SPANISH ;	{ Cassiodorus's Version ; Ferreira's Version ;	emendaos ; arrependeivos ;
PORTUGUESE ;	{ Martin's Version ; Ostervald's Version ;	convertissas ;
FRENCH ;	{ Bible Society's Edition ; Le Cene's Version ; Pasteurs de Geneve's Ed.	amendez ;
GERMAN ;	{ Luther's own First Edition of his Translation : Emden Edition ;	bessert ; betert ;
BELGIC ;	{ Leyden Edition ; States General's Edition ;	bekeert ;
NETHERLANDISH ;		POKANTECA ;
DUTCH ;		pokutuycie ; okattuklune ;
RUSSIAN ;		{ kakkialeritse ; or issumataritse ;
POLISH ;		omvender ;
FINNISH ;		tawbatlah ;
ESQUIMAUX ;		menjassal ;
DANISH ;		menassal ;
MALAY ;	{ Bible Society's Edition ; Old Translation ; Do. Do.	odifarhewch ;
WELSH ;		REPENT ;
ENGLISH ;	{ Authorized Version ;	

SECOND CLASS.

LATIN ;	{ Vulgate Version ;	agite penitentiam ;
ITALIAN ;	{ Martini's Version ;	fate penitenza ;
SPANISH ;	{ Scio's Version ;	haced penitencia ;
PORTUGUESE ;	{ Pereira's Version ;	fazei penitencia ;
FRENCH ;	{ De Sacy's Version ;	faites penitence ;
ILLYRIC ;		datte pokóra ;
BOHEMIAN ;		pokani cinte ;
FINNISH ;		tekkät parannus ;
HUNGARIAN ;		terjetek meg ;
ENGLISH ;	{ Wiclif's Version ;	do ye penaunce ;
IRISH ;	{ Rheimish Version ; O'Reilly's and H.M.M.'s Pocket Edition.	do penance ; δεδαντο δειναιζε ;

THIRD CLASS.

LATIN ;	{ Le Clerc's works ; Another Author, in Do ; One of the Fathers' Works ;	postanimadvertete ; animum mutare ; penitentiam intote ;
GERMAN ;	{ Ancient Translation ; Ancient Author ;	ducete penitentiam ; recipite penitentiam ;
SWEDISH ;	{ Common Versions ;	{ macht büss ; or thut busse ;
ICELANDIC ;	{ Common Version ;	{ görer battring ; gered idran ; or
MANX ;	{ Common Version ;	{ giored ndran ; gow jee arrys ;
GAELIC ;		gabhaibhaithreachas ;

Everyone, by this tabular view, sees, that in the First Class, the Greek original, and all the Versions next it, use a single word, which, though varied somewhat in sense, by idiom of language, will be found to express, in each case, pretty well, the meaning, though not as fully of course, as the original word; but in the Second Class, the Vulgate and all Versions made from it, and the Irish, use two words, which in all are also perfectly synonymous; and in the Third Class, though two or more words are used, yet the sense is tolerably correctly expressed. Hence the cause of the evil is not merely the use of "*aithrighe*" in Irish, though proved to be the word for "PENANCE;" but the error is exalted, by prefixing "*deanuidh*," meaning "*make ye*," "*act ye*," or "*do ye*;" precisely as "*agite*," "*haced*," "*fazei*," and "*do*," &c. &c. mean, before "*penitentiam*," "*penitencia*" and "*penance*" &c. &c. in the Vulgate, Spanish, Portuguese, and Rheimish, &c. &c. Popish Versions.

H. M. M. says the noun "*aithrighe*" comes from a root, which signifies to "*turn*" or "*change*." It does not; but suppose it did, yet why told he not, whether such radix be spelled either "*ἀθρῖγῆ*, *athrigh*," or "*ἀθάρρηαῖς* *atharraigh*,"* that few of the poor will ever know this, or any other etymology? Whereas all will recognise "*aithrighe*," as the very word, used by father, mother and priest, for "PENANCE;" and will see, that the very terms, which their Sacrificer at the Popish altar, uses, when exhorting his congregation to "DO PENANCE," are those; which H. M. M. and O'Reilly have retained, in the Irish Bible, viz. "*deanuidh aithrighe*." The Reader will find in "Donlevy's Irish and English Catechism," at p. 296-297, and p. 120-121, the very verb "*deanam*," spelled "*deynam*" or "*deynad*," affixed to "*ἀθρῖγῆ*," in the sentence "*to do Penance openly*, according to the custom of the country," &c. &c. Will H. M. M. assert, that "*aithrighe*" means here "*repentance*," "according to the custom of the country?" Which did H. M. M. ignorantly, or O'Reilly knowingly keep the word in, "manifestly to favour" Papal errors?

To set this point for ever at rest. Let me ask H. M. M. is there no one single word, in the copious Irish tongue, corresponding to *μετανοεῖν*, as well as "*shooovoo*," "*repent*," "*ravvedetevi*," "*resipiscite*" or "*corrigite*," and "*convertissæz*" or "*amendez*," &c. &c. do respectively, in the Hebrew, English, Italian, Latin and French, &c. &c. versions; or if determined to use the ambiguous "*aithrighe*," which O'Reilly makes, sometimes "*penance*," sometimes "*repentance*, or tears, or sadness, or grief," why use the substantive "*aithrighe*," with the verb "*deanuidh*," "*make*," "*do*," or "*act ye*," prefixed, so interpreting it indubitably in the Popish sense, of "*Do Penance*?" Why not use, as but one word, some imperative tense, suppose for example that of the radical verb, paternal as he says of "*aithrighe*," and meaning "*turn or change*," thus making the sense to be "*change ye*," or rather "*be ye changed*?" Pass we over wholly at present all query, if "*aithrighe*" really comes from a root, meaning "*change*," which is next to impossible, as the radix of a word, meaning "*tears*, *sadness*, *grief*;" but, if it came from some root meaning "*reproof*," or "*after-rebuke*" or "*after-condemnation*,"† in some shape, its succession of secondary and derivative meanings may easily be thus, "*Penance*, *tears*, *sadness*, *grief*, *repentance*." But truly a word's root seldom fixes its conversational meaning; for custom's use and popular habit are the laws of vocables.

Will H. M. M. please to explain, why he chose to use the Popish phrase "*deanuidh aithrighe*," which all Roman Catholics must understand to mean "*do penance*," and thus to perpetuate error, and make mistakes inevitable; when he might have easily avoided all dubiousness of expression?—Why did he not even fall in love with the imperative of the allied verb "*aithrighim*," which Lhuyd sets down for "*resipisco*," or "*I repent*"—thus, "*Resipisco. To repent, to return to a right understanding, to come to one's wits or senses again. (Irish.) Aithrighim, ata aithrea* ~~as oram~~ *as aithrea* ~~xi~~ *liom*."

* See Highland Society's "Gaelic Dictionary," Vol. I. P. 77, viz. "*Atharraich—idh—dh*; v. a. (Ath et Tar, v.) *I change, muto*."

† A friend has suggested to me, that possibly "*aithrighe*" may have originally been merely the radical syllables of *attritio*, but I doubt this derivation.

Any one of these three translations would have been less objectionable, than "deanuidh aithrige," the latter two especially.

Look now at modern Roman C. Irish Catechisms, here in universal use.* What word or words use they, for "Penance," and "DoPenance?" Take, for instance, that "printed by D. Wogan, 28, Merchant's-quay, Dublin, 1826, 24mo. pages 52" entitled "An Teagask Creestyte, agus Paidreagha; na Mainne agus an Tranona;" ("The Christian Doctrine and Prayers; of Morning and Evening;"). Coldwell, Printer, in Capel-street, has I understand, sold off this year an Edition of 10,000 of this work, and is at this moment printing another of 40,000 with an intention of stereotyping the work ultimately. This catechism, which is in Roman, not Irish characters, attempts to express the words' sound, not their proper spelling; a fact absolutely necessary to be remembered, or your readers will not at once recognise the word, here used for "penance," as that used in the Bible viz. "אִתְּרִיגֶה." Write all this word in Roman characters, it will appear "aitrige;" for "aithrige's" two h's are only poor substitutes for the t's and the g's dots; But g's dot silencing it entirely, and t's dot nearly mutiflying it, by making it an h, the word's true sound, therefore, the remaining letters, viz. "aihrie," sounded "a'ree," will nearly express. However the word's sound, this catechism always tries to express, by Nom. "ari." Gen. "hari," (sounded Nom. "arree" Gen. "harree,") which, though an imperfect attempt, necessitated by the work's plan, namely rejection of Irish characters, and attempted expression, not of a word's orthography but sound, fixes beyond dispute the fact, that People and Priest use this word for "penance."

Look now at page 37, "An 3 Ran: An 1 Leun;" (The third part; the first lesson;) "De na Sacraminte." (On the Sacraments.) "K." (Question.) "Ka vead Sacraminte an?" (How many Sacraments are there?) "P." (Answer.) "Shacht; boistu; dol fa laav esbuie; Sacramint na hARI; Sacramint Choirp Chreesta; ola yench; ord; agus posu." (Seven; baptism; going under the hand of a Bishop; SACRAMENT OF PENANCE; SACRAMENT OF CHRIST'S BODY; last unction; ordination, and marriage.) Your readers will at once see "penance" alone, here honored, by the adjunctive name "Sacrament," no less than the idolatrous Mass. Turn now to the chapter on "PENANCE," p. 38. What meaning have O'Reilly, and nominally superintending, really subordinate H. M. M. taught our poor to affix to the blessed word "repentance," by putting "aithrige," "penance," for it, and worse, by prefixing "deanuidh," "doye," in the Irish Bible, like "agite Penitentiam" in the Vulgate. I give its translation *verbatim*, as it is unnecessary to copy all the Irish.

"The 2nd Lesson."

"Q. What is the Sacrament of Penance? (ARI, Genitive of ARI.)"

"A. A Sacrament, that our Saviour Jesus Christ ordered, to give us forgiveness of sins, committed after baptism."

"Q. Can the Priests forgive sins?"

"A. They can, because they received power from our Lord Jesus Christ."

"Q. How many requisites are necessary for this Sacrament?"

"A. Five.—The first, &c. &c. The second, &c. &c. The third, &c. &c. The fourth, to confess all our sins to the Priest. The fifth, to make Satisfaction to God and our neighbour."

This is the common modern Catechism. Let us now look at an ancient Catechism, called "Catechismus, seu Doctrina Christiana, Latino-Hibernica, &c. explicata per R. D. Theobaldum Stapletonium,† Sacerdotem Hiber-

* See article No. 1, "On the utility of the Irish Language to the Established Clergy," in Ch. Exam. Feb. 1826, Vol. II. No. VIII. page 117, where catechisms and other works are enumerated.

† The writer of the above Catechism is thus mentioned by Edward O'Reilly, in his account of all the writers of Irish works, in the Ibero-Celtic Society's transactions, 1830, 4to. Dublin, p. cxc. A. D. 1639, No. cxc. "Theobald Stapleton, an Irish Priest, was author of a Latin and Irish Catechism, which was published at Brussels this year, in the Roman letter and quarto form. It is now a rare book, but there is a copy in the Library of Trinity College." O'Reilly's Catalogue of the MSS. in his Library, which is now in the Royal Irish Academy, mentions the circulation of 500 Copies of this work in Ireland.

nicum, &c." or "Adhon, an Teagasc Chriostui, iar na fhoillsui à Ladin, agus à nGaioilg, &c.&c. maile re Teaboid Gálduff, Sagart Erennach, &c." Bruxellis 1639. Small 4to.

In the preface, p. 6. we find.

"Secundum est Sacramentum Pœnitentiæ, (A si an Aithridhe, an dara Sacrament, &c) quæ est secunda Tabula post naufragium, et per quam peccatorum post Baptismum commissorum, remissionem consequimur in confessione, si ad illum sacramentum ritè dispositi accedamus."

In page 100 "Sacramentum 3 Pœnitentiæ" "Sacrament 3 Aithrighe."

At p. 109, we find "De Sacramento Pœnitentiæ." or "Ar Shacrament na hAithrighe."

"Sequitur nunc tertium Sacramentum, quod Pœnitentiæ vocatur." or

"Ara chugain à nois an treas Sacrament da ngoirthear an Aithrighe."

"Secundo, Pœnitentiam vocamus penam et afflictionem illam, quam homo, ut Deo pro peccatis satisfaciatur, in se suscipit; et sic dicimus facere aliquem magnam Pœnitentiam, si multas se jejuniis et asperitatibus exerceat." or "An 2, ni; goire amaoid Aithrighe, &c." In page 109, line 9, we find "Impositiæ" translated in the Irish Column, line 1, by "neam aithreachas" "neam aithreachas," which clearly proves that its opposite "aithreachas" was the proper word in Stapleton's mind for "Repentance," for in lines 2 and 2 he translates "Pœnitentiæ" where meaning "Penance," by "Aithrighe," and in lines 16 and 16, 17, he translates "Tertio Pœnitentiæ Sacramentum," by "An 3, ní cialluigh An Aithrig Sacrament." And in page 163, Cap. V. "Peccata contra Spiritum Sanctum," he translates "ōtum. viz. Impositiæ finalis," by "6. Bheith neamhathreach sô crith dheanuig," and not by "neamhathrighe," as O'Reilly and H. M. M. would make it to express "not doing Penance."

P. 121. "De satisfactione, quæ tertia Pars est Pœnitentiæ, &c. &c." or "Aren 3 cuid Aithrighe an leoirghnuimh, &c."

When he speaks of a particular penance ordered to be performed, he adds "breitheamhnus" "sentence or judgment," to the word "aithrighe." Thus in page 116, Cap. VI. he translates "Pœnitentiam impositam ad implendam," by "ag coimhlonna à bhreitheamhnais aithrighe, &c." and in page 118, "Pœnitentiam mihi impositam," by "chomhlonna an breitheamhnais aithrighe."

See also all through pages 109—123, &c. &c. This clearly proves that "aithrighe" has always been used in Popish Catechisms for "Penance."

Let us now examine the most celebrated of all the Irish R. C. Catechisms, of which two thousand were, I hear, printed lately, and all soon bought up, viz.

"*AN LEATHUSÓ LEIÓSDORJDE DO RÁIR LE-
USDU UCHAS FAELECHUILLÉ, ari na éapnnyz so
brnydapaç ar bheileir nsoileileir dæ, azyr us
lojheleleleir fíohé-leuun oile, &c.*" or

"The Catechism, or Christian Doctrine, by way of question and answer, drawn chiefly from the express word of God, and other pure sources, (!!!) Paris M.DCC.XLII." 8vo. Pages 518. The pages 487—498 are occupied with the pernicious abridgment of the Christian Doctrine in Irish Rhyme, composed a century before, by the Franciscan F. Bonaventure O'Heoghusa; and pages 499—516 explain "the Elements of the Irish Language," &c. Pages IV—XL have the Advertisement or preface, in English and Irish parallel pages; P. XLI—XLV shew the approbation of the work, by nine Irish priests at Paris, of whom four were Doctors of the Sorbonne, two also Provvisors of that College, and one Licentiate of do. The approbation of the Censor Royal, and the King's Permission follow. Pages XLVI—LIII. are the table of contents. Pages LIV—LVI the Errata. And all the rest of the book, viz. pages 1—486, is the Catechism, in parallel pages of Irish and English. It is a very clever work, and in many points highly creditable to the talent, industry and (mistaken) piety of its author, viz; "M. Andrew Donlevy, Licentiate of Laws, and Director or Prefect of the Irish commu-

* *SOLÉIR.*

nity at Paris, for the Education of Irish youth :—" but my only business at present is with the part relating to "PENANCE;" Let us read

"The third part of the Catechism;" "Of the Sacraments," on pages 226, 227.

"Q. What is the third thing necessary for salvation?"

"A. It is to receive the sacraments worthily, although they be not all necessary for all persons—St. John iii. 5; xx. 22. Council of Trent Sess. 7."

"Q. What is a sacrament?"

"A. It is a visible sign of an invisible grace, instituted by our Saviour Jesus Christ, for our justification and sanctification."

"Q. How many sacraments are there?" or "Ἐ. Ἐὰ μέγιστον ΣΑΚΡΑΜΕΝΤΑ ἄνθη?"

"A. Seven; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme-Unction, Holy Order, and Matrimony." or

"Ἱ. Ὡς φατέ; ἰδοὺ, Βαπτισμὸς, Διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ΣΑΚΡΑΜΕΝΤΟΝ Ἐπιτομῆς, ΣΑΚΡΑΜΕΝΤΟΝ τῆς ἡμετέρας, Ὡς δὲ δεῖσθαι, Ὁν, ἀγνὸς ἔσθαι."

Look again at "The 4th Lesson" p. 264, 265.

"Of the Sacrament of Penance" or "Do ἡ ΣΑΚΡΑΜΕΝΤΟΝ τῆς ἡμετέρας."

"Q. What is the sacrament of Penance?" or

"Ἐ. Ἐπεὶ ἵς ΣΑΚΡΑΜΕΝΤΟΝ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἄνθη?"

"A. It is a sacrament, whereby the sins, that we commit after baptism, are forgiven us." p. 266—267. "Q. Can the priest forgive sins?"

"A. He can, because Jesus Christ gave him the power, Saint John xx. 23."

"Q. Is the sacrament of Penance (ἡ ἡμετέρας) necessary for salvation?"

"A. Yes, it is as necessary, as baptism, in regard of all those, who fall into mortal sin, after they are baptized."

p. 268, 269. Q. How many conditions are necessary for the Penitent?

"A. There are five—First, &c. Second, &c. Third, &c. Fourth; to make a good confession of all his sins to a Priest, that is approved by the Church. Fifth; to make Satisfaction to God and his neighbour, according to his ability.

Look again at "The fifth Lesson." Pages 272—273.

Q.—What is the second thing necessary for the sacrament of Penance?" (ἡ ἡμετέρας.)

See also pages 282 and 283, "of Penance" "ἡ ἡμετέρας," 284 and 285 "Penance" "ἡμετέρας." In fact, look throughout pages 264—307, and every where the word "aithrighe" is used for "Penance;" and then look at "The 9th Lesson; on Indulgences," pages 308—317; and see in pages 314—315, how "the benefit or fruit of the superabundant satisfaction and merits of Jesus Christ and of the Saints, which is called the *Treasure of the Church*," is "applied liberally to us," and "how doth the church, by indulgences, forgive the punishment due to sinners."

As to the word "aithrighe," for "μετάνοια" or "μετάνοια," H. M. M. says, in his Letter to Edinburgh, (page 628) "to express it by a periphrasis would, we conceive, do incalculably more injury, than the use of the word in question," which yet I have proved to mean "penance," or at least to be always ambiguous. Why then, as I said above, did he not express "μετάνοια," or "Repent ye," by the simple imperative of "athruigh," "atharraigh," "atharraich" or "aithrighim," or of any other more suitable verb, and not by the Popish *periphrasis*, "deanuidh aithrighe," or "Do Penance?"

Now let the whole decision, between H. M. M. and me, rest on his answers to the following questions. Do not the Vulgate Latin and the Rheimish English, (the only authorised Popish versions,) use "Agite Penitentiam," and "Do Penance," in Matt. iii. 2, &c. &c. as what the translators and readers meant, and do mean, and not "Repent?" Should the Romanists ever be forced, in shame or self defence, to publish an Irish version, as they were forced to edit the Rheimish English one, will not the translators use "deanuidh aithrighe," to express their own same meaning to their readers? Are not these the words, that H. M. M. contends for, in the present version for the use

of the Poor? Do not the Romanists use these very words, for "Do Penance?" as for example in Donlevy's Irish and English Catechism, as alluded to before, pages 296—297, "or do Penance openly," ("no airtirige do deirnamh or airtiridh") "according to the custom of the country," &c. &c. The reader will find the very words "airtirige do deirnamh," "airtirige do deirnamh" put for "To Repent" in the Irish Bible for example in Mark vi. 12. Rev. ii. 21, &c. &c.

After the proofs, which I have given already, that the word "airtirige" is universally used in Ireland to mean "Penance," a thousand times for once that it is used to mean "Repentance;" your readers will know, what value to set upon H. M. M.'s assertion, "that it could not possibly suggest the idea of penance." Being convinced also, that there is no sufficient reason to think, that it comes at all from the root "airtirt" or even "airtirige," "to turn or change,"* and that it is well known, that the common people will take all words, in their popular meaning, and never enquire about their etymology, (or even guess at it, when the word is much changed in its spelling or sound, while passing from its root to its derivative form,) you will see what a fallacy is contained in these words; "and here it is particularly to be remarked, that as the Irish is an original language, and has the roots of its derivative words within itself, every one familiar with Irish, however otherwise unlettered, at once perceives, that the term alluded to implies a change or turning," &c. But does the verb, that he says is its root, really mean "to turn," like the syllable "vert" in "convert," or to change from one state into another, or from one thing into another, like the expression, "Be ye transformed, in the renewing of your mind?" O'Brien's Dictionary, "the well known work of a Roman Catholic Bishop," states at least airtirt to mean "he arose or removed," viz. from one "country to another," which it is evident is quite a different thing, from what H. M. M. states, when he says its root means "changing or turning,"† in the sense of conversion or change of mind. After the number of words, that I have quoted from various Dictionaries, meaning "Repentance," and the proof, that I will give that the Gaelic Bible never uses "airtirige," but always "airtreachas," we may well wonder, that H. M. M. should have had the hardihood, to tell the Scotch Committee; "We cannot find, that there is any other word, so suitable in the language." Why even O'Brien gives five other words for "Repentance," viz. "ealta, airtirigeal, airtirigeala, airtirigeal, & airtirigeal": Shaw's Gaelic Dictionary gives as many or more; Lhuyd's four or five; the Highland Society's Gaelic Dictionary six or eight; Walsh's twice as many; Plunkett's as many; the "Great Caise of Words," twenty or more; and his friend O'Reilly at least six; yet H. M. M. says, "another word is rendered "Repent," in some dictionaries, but it properly signifies agitation of mind, dismay, &c., which would be more favourable to the idea of Penance, than that which stands in our edition." Your readers have seen, that but

* It is barely possible, that "airtirige," which the Gaelic Bible uses for "Repentance," comes from "airtirige" But it is evident that "airtirige," "Penance" comes from "airt," "after," and "irige," "reproof." By examining O'Brien's or O'Reilly's Dictionaries, your readers will be convinced, that in dozens of compound words, as for example "airtirigeal," which O'Brien says comes from "airt after," and "irigeal sorrow," (see these words,) the force of the prefix "airt" is either "after or re." They will find "irige reproof," in both Dictionaries. These two words, which exactly compose the letters of the word "airtirige Penance," express its meaning. It is remarkable too, that M'Curtin's, and many of the more ancient Dictionaries spell it with an accent over the second I, thus "airtirige," which makes this Etymology more obvious.

† The word used in Jerem. xxxi. 16, for "turn," in the sense of "convert thou me, and I shall be converted" is rirtirt and rirtirt.

one of the above quotations gives "agitation of mind or dismay," as the meaning of any of the words, that they use for "Repentance."* He will not therefore henceforward find persons so ready, as the Scotch were, to believe what he said: viz. "We have retained the word therefore, as we found it, because there seemed to be no reason for altering it;" and, "with regard to the latter part of your communication, that which respects our edition of the Sacred Scriptures, we are happy to say, that there is no foundation whatever, for the hints and surmises, which have been suggested to you by some unknown friend." H. M. M. ought to be made to go on a Pilgrimage to Edinburgh, as a "*Penance*," with peas in his shoes, and there to confess his error on his knees.

Need we wonder, while this Papal error as to "*Penance*" remains, that the Kingscourt Teachers and Scholars, who are described by H. M. M. as "men; however, who with a special jealousy of doctrine, have sifted and searched it," (The Irish Testament,) "like the Bereans of old," (!!!) "sitting down at first to discover doctrinal, (not critical) errors, if they could, but ending in the conviction, which I now adduce," should, after having "compared it with both the Protestant and Rhemish translations," on finding, that where "*our own Rhemish*," as they say has, "do *Penance*," it has the very Irish words, by which their Priests, and the old women at the hearthside, enforce the same Sacrament, declare, by his own testimony. "Finally, we consider, that the reading of the holy Scriptures is" &c. &c. &c. "and our privilege as Roman Catholics." Mark that special expression. Every Romanist will subscribe similar declarations, as to Rheims's, and Douay's, "*Do Penance*," version. But could H. M. M. get a new "roll, signed by 113 of these teachers, and 262 adult scholars, in behalf of at least 5000 others," or even "another roll, signed with the autographs of 3221 of the same people," to disprove all here proved, as to "*PENANCE*," or "*aithrige*," not properly interpreting "*μετανοια*?" I believe the resolutionists at Kingscourt to be a fine, brave, clever, independent set of men; but I know most of them to be sincere Roman Catholics, and as such too I respect them, though in error. But will they not think it "*their privilege*," in Popism, to have "*μετανοια*" translated "*Do Penance*," or "*deanuidh aithrige*," not "*Repent*," in Irish, as well as in the Vulgate Latin, and the Rhemish English Versions; as they did asseverate it "*an accurate Irish translation*," solely because here, and as they truly say, "*throughout, most agreeing with*" the former, which is alone considered orthodox or canonical, by the harlot-mother church, which of course rejects the heretical Greek and Hebrew originals.

H. M. M. too hastily† praises Robert Boyle, as "that uncompromising Philosopher, so jealous for the honour of God's Revelation, that he could on no account admit of the Apocrypha into it," when "he caused to be printed" the Old and New Testament in Irish; but he does not mention, how unkind this praise of Boyle is to the excellent Bedell, who was the very man, who got the Apocrypha, as well as the Old Testament, translated by King or Sheridan into Irish, with a view to their publication, as any one may see in Marsh's Library at Patrick's Cathedral, by asking for a manuscript with this title,

"A transcript of the Irish translation of the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, made by the procurement of Dr. Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore. His original copy. (being the second volume of the works, which I left in the hands of Doctor Huntingdon, Provost of Trinity College, near Dublin, some time before King William landed in England, and was some

* I have found but one instance, viz: in Lhuyd, where he gives "*aithneal*," in a compound sentence, the sense of "dismay," but not one example of that meaning being attached to "*aithreachas*," or to any of the other words.

† Boyle's own MS. letters to Provost Marsh, now at the Hibernian Bible Society's Office, make it doubtful, however, that he had not any such unconquerable objection to the Apocrypha's being printed, in addition to the Bible, as he should have had.

time after that, in said College Library, as appears by the catalogue of the manuscripts, which the said College printed, in the large catalogue of manuscript books, published at Oxford, where it is called Bishop Bedell's Irish translation of the Bible, though it was only of the Apocryphal books, being now unhappily lost." That this title was added by the copyist, at Bishop Marsh's desire, is proved by his signature, in another hand-writing beneath, viz. "*Narcissus Armacanus*." that is, (Narcissus Marsh, Primate, or Archbishop of Armagh.)

H. M. M. after calling one single paper "a circular and printed letter, which has just been received by me," adds, "I allude to that letter, upon which you," viz. the Examiner "have already commented," namely in your July criticism, and then proceeds to animadvert both on it, and on my August answer, as if both had reached him together. His words, and his reference to your critique fix his remarks to that circular's first edition. Let him say, did not I send it to him myself, last June, and the second edition in July, each immediately on publication? He "trusts," he "may have grace to do so, in the very meekest spirit, especially as I am obliged to speak out somewhat strongly;" but illustrates his success afterwards, by "*bearing false witness against his neighbours*," by accusing me falsely of writing "*anonymously*," and of abetting "no new effort of the enemy of truth, to keep out of popular use a book he so detests and dreads," and by saying that "the Pope with all his Jesuits, could scarcely frame an encyclical letter, better calculated to stop the circulation of the" (false translations of the) "Bible in Ireland, than this before us, were this one passage generally read and its contents believed; nor have I, even in a Pope's letter, ever met an assertion more untrue in its sweeping form, than this, which I have now commented on." I have proved its truth above, and will prove it even still more clearly. But H. M. M.'s prayer for "*the very meekest spirit*," appears to have remained unanswered; certainly his wish succeeded "*to speak out rather strongly*." Still he hopes, though "some of the following remarks cannot but appear inimical to two or three individuals, yet even they must in candour admit, that my silence hitherto affords evidence of christian forbearance." I truly admit it not, translating "silence" and "forbearance," to mean *unwillingness to have the Irish Bible's errors canvassed publicly at all, and fear lest the re-edition's superintendent should come into public odium, or the undertaker's incompetence be proved before men*. H. M. M. says of Mr. T. C. "I differ from him essentially, in respect to his present ends, as well as his means of following them." Let H. M. M. say, did he not differ formerly from Mr. T. C.'s first ends and first means, and at last come round to both, which has added perhaps not a little to his own credit? Let him take but another similar step now, and pass the Rubicon at once. More of the sun's light is the dawning morn's and full noon's only difference. Evening has but waning light; night none but borrowed and lunar.

But why did not H. M. M. state, that by some oversight, the word "*Penance*" does not occur any where in O'Brien's own Edition of his Irish-English Dictionary in Roman letters, so that I can not find "*aithrige*" at all in it. And consequently though the work is widely circulated now, by the new Edition in Irish letters, which, I suppose felt bound, as an exact copy, to omit that word, yet when the poor readers meet "*איִתְרִיגֶה*" in the Bible, they must still necessarily, if ignorant, look for its meaning in O'Reilly's, where they will find it means first "*Penance*," and next "*Repentance*," and will of course interpret it according to the universal system of their conversation at home, and at the Mass-house to mean "*Penance*." The title of O'Briens' Dictionary is "*Focalóir Gaoidhíle—Sax—Bhéarla, or an Irish-English Dictionary, Paris MDCCLXVIII*" 4to. Look at page 18 column 2, and you will find "*aithmheal—Repentance, an after sorrow*," and in page 19, column 1,

"aithreadh & aithreachas—Repentance," and in page 198, "εαλτα, Repentance," but no where do we find in this Dictionary, I believe, either "αἰτρίτζε" or even "αἰτρίδε" or "Penance;" and consequently as the words "αἰτρεαδάρ, or αἰτρεαδύρ," and αἰτρεαδ, are never met in the Irish New Testament, except in the following places.—"αἰτρεαδάρ," in Matt. xxi. 29; xxvii. 3. Luke xvii. 4. 2 Cor. vii. 8. (twice); Hebrews vii. 21. Rev. ii. 5.—αἰτρεαδύρ, in Acts xvii. 30. xxvi. 20. Rom. xi. 29.—αἰτρεαδ in 2 Cor. vii. 10. But αἰτρεαδ not at all, and—αἰτρήδα not at all, as far as I can find at least, therefore the reader will inevitably think, that as "αἰτρίτζε" is the word, that occurs in every other place, viz. about 55 times, and in the most important texts, it must be intended to mean "Penance" only; for otherwise, why should not the Translators and Editors have used one or other of the above words, (or some other more suitable word,) any one of which would, in Ireland, mean "Repentance" and never "Penance." But the following table of all the texts, in which the different moods, tenses, numbers, persons, and cases of the words "μετανοῶ, μετανοῖς, ἀμετανόητος, μεταμέλομαι, ἀμεταμέλητος;" occur in the Greek New Testament, with the English, Irish and Gaelic Bibles' versions of the words annexed, will show, what an enormous error this is, and how wisely careful the Gaelic Bible and Catechisms now are always to use "aithreachas," and never to admit in any sentence "aithrige," though H. M. M. says the Bible uses "the same word." When will men see, that truth alone is safe?

I am well aware, that in the reading lessons extracted from the Irish Bible, and attached to Mr. T. Connellan's spelling book many years ago, he left the word "aithrige" as he found it, because he did not profess to make a new translation, but merely to enable the poor to read books already published for one hundred and fifty years; and he was even unfairly discouraged by many from making any alterations.* But, though he did not at the moment reflect, that as the word had been so abused and perverted, as to be at the least always ambiguous, meaning in some cases, (and he always, in his own mind, as he knew the truth, and could read the original, understanding,) "Repentance;" but, in the minds of the poor, conveying the idea of "Penance," and the idea of "a Sacrament," and often excluding all idea of "true Repentance," or "ῥίον αἰτρεαδάρ,"† therefore, another unequivocal word should have been substituted, and he has been long determined never to insert it again, in any work he publishes.

* Your readers will see, I trust, that I act honestly in this paper. It is not the custom of us, medical men, to act as lawyers too commonly do; viz. either to suppress all evidence, that is against their cause, or to pervert whatever might be made to tell in favour of the opposite client, and thus, "to make the worse appear the better reason." Here not a single particle of evidence has been kept back, whether it appeared to make against or for myself, or my argument. I have long had not a shadow of doubt, that truth was on my side in my complaints, as to the Irish Bible's errors; and the investigations, that were necessary, in order to write this paper, have still more confirmed my conviction on that point. But I love truth and those who teach me it; and if any one, therefore, not excepting even H. M. M. will point out to me any fallacy in my reasoning, or even overturn, by more cogent documentary evidence, any part, or the whole of my argument, and of its abutting proofs, I shall feel most sincerely grateful: At present I think it impossible to do so, or to answer this paper satisfactory, for I have endeavoured, over and over again, in reading it through, to find out any fallacies in its main arguments, but without success. If others can do so, let me, I entreat them, have the benefit of their help; for truth alone is to be sought and coveted and followed; and I always loved the man, who came to me and said, I will shew you where you are in any error, or I will teach you a truth you never knew before, or did not value sufficiently; and never will I be one of those, who boast that they have fixed ideas, and never change their mind; or who think that whatever they believe or have once asserted, is therefore necessarily immutable truth, and must be clung to "per fas et nefas."

† Any one, who will consult the following, or any other modern Protestant Gaelic Catechism, will have no doubt, that "aithreachas" is a preferable word to "aithrige." I. "Leabhar Aithgearrnan Ceist" &c. 1823, 32mo. pages 40, see p. 31, Question 87, &c. II. Willison's "Leabhar Cheist na Mathar," &c. 1829, 24mo. pages 52, see p. 28, Questions and Answers. III. Rev. Dr. A. M. Thompson's "Leabhar Ceasnuchaidh," &c. 1835, 32mo. pages 77, see p. 17, Question 17. P. 38, Questions 82, 83, 85, & 90, 91, 92.

Various Moods, Tenses, Numbers, and Cases of

		Deanwò aithreachas :	Gabhaibh aithreachas :
Matt.iii. 2 ;	Repent ye :	Deanwò aithreachas :	Gabhaibh aithreachas :
iv. 17 ;	Repent :	Deanwò aithreachas :	Gabhaibh aithreachas,
xi. 20 ;	they repented	deanadh aithreachas :	d'rinn iad aithreachas.
21 ;	they would have repented	deanadh aithreachas :	dheanadh iad aithreachas
xii. 41 ;	they repented	deanadh aithreachas :	rinn iad aithreachas
Mark i. 15 ;	Repent ye,	deanadh aithreachas :	deanaibhse aithreachas,
vi. 12 ;	men should repent.	deanadh aithreachas :	deanadh <i>doine</i> aithreachas.
Luke x. 13 ;	they had repented,	deanadh aithreachas :	dheanadh iad aithreachas,
xi. 32 ;	they repented	deanadh aithreachas :	rinn iadsan aithreachas,
xiii. 3 ;	ye repented,	deanadh aithreachas :	dean sibh aithreachas,
5 ;	ye repented,	deanadh aithreachas :	dean sibh aithreachas,
xv. 7 ;	that repenteth,	deanadh aithreachas :	a ni aithreachas,
10 ;	that repenteth,	deanadh aithreachas :	a ni aithreachas.
xvi. 30 ;	they will repent.	deanadh aithreachas :	ni iad aithreachas.
xvii. 3 ;	he repents,	deanadh aithreachas :	ghabhas e aithreachas,
4 ;	I repent ;	deanadh aithreachas :	Tha aithreachas oru ;
Acts ii. 38 ;	Repent,	deanadh aithreachas :	Deanaibh aithreachas,
iii. 19 ;	Repent ye	deanadh aithreachas :	deanaibhse aithreachas
viii. 22 ;	Repent	deanadh aithreachas :	Gabh aithreachas
xvii. 30 ;	to repent	deanadh aithreachas :	aithreachas a dheanamh :
xxvi. 20 ;	that they should repent,	deanadh aithreachas :	iad a dheanamh aithreachais

(or) cubhaidh do aithreachas

as to some other principal words in the Bible, such as Spirit, Sin, Salvation, Sacrifice, Righteousness, Justification, &c. &c. which will show, even more fully, the possession, false doctrine, and mistranslations, in the Irish Bible, and the impossibility of correcting it, except by a combined new translation, to be undertaken by eight, ten, twenty, thirty-seven or fifty critical scholars, in the manner that was followed, as to the Gaelic and English Version.

TEXT.	GREEK ORIGINAL	ENGLISH AUTHORIZED VERSION.	IRISH VERSION, (POCKET EDITION, 1830)	GAELIC VERSION, (EDITION 1807.)
2 Cor. xii. 21 ;	μετανοήσαντες	which have repented	δέαννα αἰτένῃζε	do ghabh aithreachas
Revel. ii. 5 ;	μετανοήσας	repent,	ἔβλεπ αἰθέακαρ οὐτ,	gabh aithreachas,
16 ;	μετανοήσας	thou repent.	ἠδεαῖνα εὐ αἰτένῃζε.	gabh thu aithreachas.
21 ;	μετανοήσας	Repent ;	Δεαν αἰτένῃζε ;	Dean aithreachas
21 ;	μετανοήσας	to repent	αἰτένῃζε δο δεανᾶδ	aithreachas a ghabhail
iii. 3 ;	μετανοήσας	she repented	δεανᾶ ρῖ αἰτένῃζε.	do ghabh i aithreachas.
19 ;	μετανοήσας	repent.	δέαν αἰτένῃζε.	gabh aithreachas.
ix. 20 ;	μετανοήσας	repent.	δέαν αἰτένῃζε.	dean aithreachas.
21 ;	μετανοήσας	repented	δέανᾶδαν αἰτένῃζε	do ghabh aithreachas
xvi. 9 ;	μετανοήσας	repented they	δέανᾶδαν αἰτένῃζε	a ghabh iad aithreachas
11 ;	μετανοήσας	they repented	δέανᾶδαν αἰτένῃζε	d' rinn iad aithreachas,
		repented	δέανᾶδαν αἰτένῃζε	do ghabh iad aithreachas

Various Cases of the Noun *Metánoia*.

N.B. The Modern Gaelic Bible's Edition, we see, invariably uses "*Aithreachas*," for "*Repentance*," and "*To Repent*," I have not yet been able to ascertain, whether the old Editions, or the Polish Translations, used "*Aithreachas*," or "*Aithre*," but I suspect that they did, and that this word has consequently been rejected; nor have I yet been able, to procure a Modern or Ancient Papist Highland Gaelic Catechism, to see what word it uses for "*Penitence*," but I have no doubt, that they used the same word, as our Romanists here.

Matt. iii. 8 ;	τῆς μετανοίας,	for repentance :	do'n aἰτένῃζε :	do'n aithreachas,
11 ;	μετανοίας	repentance :	αἰτένῃζε :	aithreachais ;
ix. 13 ;	μετανοίας.	repentance.	αἰτένῃζε.	aithreachais.
Mark. i. 4 ;	μετανοίας	of repentance,	ἡ αἰτένῃζε	aithreachais,
ii. 17 ;	μετανοίας.	repentance,	αἰτένῃζε.	aithreachais,
Luke iii. 3 ;	μετανοίας	of repentance	ἡ αἰτένῃζε	aithreachais,
8 ;	τῆς μετανοίας.	of repentance ;	δο'n αἰτένῃζε	aithreachais
v. 32 ;	μετανοίας.	repentance.	αἰτένῃζε .	aithreachais.
xv. 7 ;	μετανοίας.	repentance,	αἰτένῃζε.	aithreachais
xxiv. 47 ;	μετανοίας	repentance	αἰτένῃζε	aithreachais
Acts v. 31 ;	μετανοίας	repentance	αἰτένῃζε	aithreachais
xi. 18 ;	τὴν μετανοίαν	repentance	αἰτένῃζε	aithreachais

TEXT.	GREEK ORIGINAL.	ENGLISH AUTHORIZED VERSION.	IRISH VERSION, (POCKET-EDIT. 1830.)	GAELIC VERSION, (EDITION 1807.)
Acts xiii. 24; xix. 4; xx. 21; xxvi. 20;	μετανοίας μετανοίας, μετανοίας, τις μετανοίας;	of repentance, of repentance repentance for repentance.	na haiténiḡe, na haiténiḡe, na iténiḡe, d'ón aiténiḡe.	aithreachais aithreachais aithreachas an aithreachais. or, air aithreachas. aithreachais? aithreachais aithreachas: aithreachas aithreachais aithreachais: aithreachais, gu h'aithreachas.
Rom. ii. 4; 2 Cor. vii. 9; 10; 2 Tim. ii. 25; Heb. vi. 1; 6; xii. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 9;	μετανοίας μετανοίας μετανοίας μετανοίας μετανοίας μετανοίας, μετανοίας μετανοίας	repentance? repentance: repentance repentance of repentance: repentance; repentance.	aiténiḡe? na haiténiḡe: aiténiḡe aiténiḡe na haiténiḡe aiténiḡe; aiténiḡe, aiténiḡe.	
Number, Case, and Gender of the Adjective Ἀμετανόητος.				
Rom. ii. 5;	ἀμετανόητον	impenitent	neaiténiḡeacá,	neo-aithreachail,
Various Moods, Tenses, Numbers, Persons, and Cases of the Verb Μεταμέλειμι;				
Matt. xxi. 29; 32; xxvii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 8; 8; Heb. vii. 21;	μεταμελῶν, μεταμελῶντι μεταμελῶντι μεταμέλειμι, μεταμέλειμι μεταμελῶντες	he repented, ye repented repented himself; I do repent, I did repent: will repent,	do gab aiténeacáir é, deḡnaabair aiténiḡe do gab aiténeacáir é, bfaíre 'na aiténeacáir oram, naíðre 'na aiténeacáir oram: gabab aiténeacáir é,	ghabh e aithreachas do ghabh sibh aithreachas ghabh e aithreachas, cha ('n'eil) aithreachas orm, do bha aithreachas orm: ghabh e aithreachas, aithreachais.
Various Numbers, Cases, and Genders of the Adjective Ἀμετανόητος.				
Rom. xi. 29; 2 Cor. vii. 10;	Ἀμετανόητος ἀμετανόητον	without repentance: not to be repented of:	3an aiténeacáir. nac aiténeacáir:	gun aithreachas. do nach gabhar aithreachas:

Now from this table it is manifest, that the Gaelic New Testament never uses, as H. M. M. asserted it did, "the same word," which the Irish version uses, viz. "aithrighe," which means "penance" in Ireland; but in every instance, whether the Greek word be "μετανίσω, μετάνοια, ἀμεταμέλητος, μεταμέλειαι, or ἀμεταμέλητος," it uses "aithreachas," (which never means "Penance" in Ireland.) And in several places of course, the word occurs in different cases, for instance "aithreachais," the Genitive, &c. The Gaelic version also, does not so often use the verb "deanaim," "I do," before the word "aithreachas," but more commonly prefixes the verb "gabhaim" "I receive," which, even if the word "aithrighe" followed, would prevent the certainty of the phrase being understood to mean "Penance," in Ireland. But the Irish version, in every instance except four, viz. Luke xvii. 4, Acts xvii. 30, xxvi. 20, and Rev. ii. 5, uses "aithrighe," to translate "μετανίσω and μετάνοια," and an adjective compounded of it also, for "ἀμεταμέλητος;" while for "μεταμέλειαι" it always, except once, viz. Matt. xxi. 32, uses "Αἰτρεᾶδᾶρ," and this latter too more usually with "gabhaim," "I receive," than "deanaim," "I do," prefixed; * and for "ἀμεταμέλητος" it also uses either "Αἰτρεᾶδᾶνρ," (which is the same word as "Αἰτρεᾶδᾶρ,") or "Αἰτρεᾶδ," which means the same. As to the above four excepted instances, we find, in Luke xvii. 4, and Rev. ii. 5 "Αἰτρεᾶδᾶρ," while in Acts xvii. 30, and xxvi. 20, we find "Αἰτρεᾶδᾶνρ," and in all these cases the Greek word is "μετανίσω," and in the last two cases also, it has "δο δέσῃδ," annexed. In Acts xxvi. 20, though the Greek idea of "μετανίσω" and "μετάνοια," occurs twice, it is expressed first, by "Αἰτρεᾶδᾶνρ," where repentance of the heart is chiefly spoken of, and afterwards by "Αἰτρινίջε," where "doing works meet for" "μετάνοια" is spoken of. If any thing would have fixed the meaning of "Αἰτρινίջε" in the minds of the Irish Papist readers, as "Penance," this single verse, after the facts just stated as to the five Greek words, above enumerated, and the almost uniform, and yet in some texts, confused use of Αἰτρινίջε, (with δεῖν Αἰτρινίջεᾶδ,) Αἰτρεᾶδᾶρ, or Αἰτρεᾶδᾶνρ, and Αἰτρεᾶδ, will prove what I say, beyond all dispute; even if the exclusion of "aithrighe" from the Gaelic Books did not make it manifest. Any one, who will, like me, examine all the texts, will almost feel convinced, that the ambiguous word "Αἰτρινίջε" was intentionally used, *ad captum vulgi*. The word "aithrighe" too is never, I believe, applied to God in the Irish Testament, † which will make it more likely to be understood as "Penance." I shall show hereafter, if permitted, that Papists have had a great share in translating and printing the Irish Bible, and of course preferred "aithrighe."

I confess I am somewhat surprised, that the Gaelic Bible is not uniform in using even "gabhaim aithreachas," "I receive repentance," * but sometimes uses also "deanaim aithreachas," "I do or make repentance;" for I perceive by the Highland Society's Gaelic Dictionary, vol. ii. p. 690, if correct, that the Roman Catholics, who are numerous among the Highlanders and Islanders, though small in proportion, compared with the whole number in the Scotch nation, who speak Gaelic, have actually degraded "aithreachas," sometimes to mean "penance," just as the millions of Romanists here have exalted

* Even O'Reilly himself, in his Dictionary, puts under "Αἰτρεᾶρ, aithreas, Repentance, compunction" the phrase "ἡ ἀἰτρεᾶρ," for "I repent," and yet in the Bible he used δεῖν Αἰτρινίջε, and what is worse prefixed it to Αἰτρινίջε; and as O'Brien's dictionary has not got "aithrighe" at all in it, the poor readers of the Bible, finding that O'Reilly translates "I repent," by "ἡ ἀἰτρεᾶρ," and that the first meaning, that he puts for "Αἰτρινίջε" is "penance," and the first for "δεῖν" is "do," will inevitably think, that "δεῖν Αἰτρινίջε," in the Bible, edited by him, means "DO YE PENANCE."

† See note D on page 176.

"*ḏḡḡḡḡḡḡ*," from its proper meaning of "Penance," to mean occasionally "Repentance," of which they make "Penance" almost the essence. Hence we find, in the above cited page, that the fourth word for "*Penance*" is "*aithreachas*," as already quoted; but, as I have already shewn, that two other excellent Scotch Dictionaries do not give any such meaning as "*penance*," for "*aithreachas*," it is probably a mistake of the Highland Society's Dictionary, or a misuse or very rare application of the word. See pages 6, 7; 7, 7.

In pages 627, 629, H. M. M. accuses me of "*addressing*" a "*letter to the Irish Society*," or its "*Committee*," "*respecting*" this error as to "*Penance*" in the Irish Bible, as if it were an offence; I was a member of its Committee, and of course did orally object to it, as soon as I was myself aware of the error. But I never wrote any letter to them expressly on this subject, and the only letter, in which I believe I alluded to it, was one which I wrote, after giving in my resignation of a seat on the Committee, and this very letter was written in answer to an express request of theirs, that I would explain my reasons for resigning. I had been long so dissatisfied with the general management of the Society, and had found all my efforts to get it all corrected so fruitless, that I wrote a letter on, (I think,) 8 May, 1829, resigning my seat, and saying that I was sorry to do so without giving my reasons, but that I had written a long letter explaining them in full; however, that on reading it over again I was afraid, that it would give offence or pain, and perhaps also do no good, and had consequently burned it. After the next Meeting of Committee I got the following letter, (May 13, 1829,) from one of the Secretaries; *—

My Dear Sir, I am desired by the Committee, to express to you their sorrow, that any circumstance of disapprobation should have induced you to withdraw yourself from amongst them; and to say how thankful they would be to you, if you would favour them with the substance of the letter, to which you referred, as containing your reasons for leaving the Committee. They are particularly anxious to be fully in possession of your sentiments. I remain, Dear Sir, with much esteem, yours very truly, *****

Thus solicited, I did of course write and fully explained my sentiments against some proceedings of the Society, and amidst a long illustration of defects as to management, and their causes, I alluded in a few lines to this error as to Penance, in the Irish Bible. To this letter I never, that I know of, got any answer, though H. M. M. says "his letter to the Irish Society respecting Penance, which was parallel to this," (viz. the Edin. B.S.'s one to him) "was similarly replied to." H. M. M. is at perfect liberty to publish that letter, provided he only publish it all, and correctly. As I had foreseen, however, it only gave offence to one or two, whose AUTOCRACY of the Society it censured, and it did no ultimate good. One thing, that I had also found fault with, just before I resigned, was, that the practice of the Society totally contradicted its rules; and I wished the one or the other to be altered, so as to make them agree, in order that we might not be obtaining money from the public, on the supposition that we were always following the Highland plan of Circulating Schools, as the Rules state, (see Rules V. VI. VII.), when in fact we never tried that excellent plan fairly, or I may say at all. The result of my complaint, however, has been curious, for the Rules have never since been published by H. M. M. in any Report, issued since 1829, up to the present day, as any one may see by looking at the 12th, 13th, 14th, & 15th, now before me, for 1830, 1831, 1832, 1833, which is certainly a very effectual method of preventing the discrepancy being observed, but in my opinion not a very honest one. The rules are in the Report for 1828—9, published in Spring 1829, but these first pages of that Report were printed, you will observe, between the anniversary, viz. the 17th March, and my long letter in the end of May.

* Thus the Committee and one of the Secretaries induced me, against my will, to write, and now I am abused by the other Secretary, or H. M. M. for doing as they wished. This is of a piece with H. M. M.'s first interfering, unasked, to get the Primate, to bind up Mr. Owen Connellan, not to make any alterations in the Edition of the Irish Prayer Book, with which publication he acknowledges he had no concern; and when it was printed, accusing Mr. Owen Connellan to the public and his employers, of "*execrating unfitness to be trusted*," and "*of gross unfaithfulness*," because he obeyed orders implicitly; thus betraying him into a snare to injure him with his Grace and the Christian Knowledge Society, because they dared first to employ Mr. Owen Connellan, without H. M. M.'s licence.

Not having kept any copy of my own letter, and not finding any such answer, as H. M. M. stated to have been sent, among my papers, and believing that I had never received any, but yet thinking that I might possibly be forgetful, I wrote to the Irish Society to request a copy of my letter and of this supposed answer; for I thought that H. M. M. would scarcely have stated, that I had written a letter, or that a letter was written to me, unless both were facts. My impression, that I had never written expressly about this matter, was proved to be correct, by the following extract from my long letter, explanatory of my resignation, as above stated, being all that was sent to me, by their Clerk in answer to my application. "When a Protestant Society, with Protestant funds, to which I myself contributed, prints an Irish Bible, in which the Irish for "Do Penance" is substituted for "Repent," and this solely, because a former erroneous translation did the same, I think it but a mockery to talk of Christian principles; and I feel it to be full time for me to withdraw, and have nothing to do with a current, that I could not stem. I think such a proceeding an imposition on the ignorance of the public, and am convinced, that it will be the cause of evils, more than are at present foreseen."

The other part of my application was not replied to at all, nor even alluded to. I therefore wrote again, requesting a copy of the answer, and only on this day, (29th October, 1833,) got an answer from the Assistant Secretary saying, that no such document could be found or traced. My letter, therefore, appears to have remained totally unanswered; and hence it is evident, that I got no satisfaction by H. M. M.'s, or any body else's answer, whether called his or theirs, though he had thought that a reply, which was never written, should have silenced, if not convinced me; for in alluding to the objection he says "it had been fully refuted in their answer," which is not the fact in any sense of the words. Was there any thing criminal in my conduct in this matter? I rejoice that I did privately what I could, to get a fatal error rectified. Had I not done so first, and that for years, I would not now publish.

He speaks as if he criminated my "repeating the objection, in a letter to the Hibernian Bible Society's Committee, some time in 1832." I had subscribed to both these Societies' general objects, and also for this special publication; and when I found such an error continued, it would have been no wonder, if I had written to remonstrate. Had I had more leisure, it would be a sin not to have done so; but the fact is, that H. M. M. states what never occurred. I never wrote a letter to the Hibernian Bible Society, on the subject at all; but I wrote once to a Provisional Committee, for forming an opposition Society, viz. a new Dublin Bible Society, (to be called by a new name), in 1832, who had asked me to become a member of their Committee, which request I declined in a long letter of 8 pages, giving my reasons in full, of which I thought it but kind, to send a copy to the Hibernian Bible Society. My letter contained only one single sentence about the Irish Bible, and that merely incidentally, namely thus. In speaking of the British and Foreign Bible Society's principles, I praised the English authorized Version, as admirable and honest, (though not perfect,) and therefore, with the strictest propriety circulated, and I said. "The same I may say of any Foreign Version; it is right to circulate the best that can be got, even though it may be imperfect, provided only it is on the whole honestly translated, like the Authorized Version; but it is criminal to circulate any version, that is dishonestly translated, even in a single verse or word, as is the case with the Vulgate and Rheimish and Doway, &c. which latter were, I believe, mis-translated to serve a heretical purpose, and are sometimes circulated even by Protestants, to gratify expediency not principle. The translation of the word "Repent," in the Irish version, reprinted by the Hibernian Bible Society, is similarly false, and this without necessity, and calculated to mislead especially those most likely to be misled."

I did not expect any reply to this letter from either Society; for it was in answer to one from the new one, and I merely sent a copy of it to the old

*

one, as it related in some manner to their concerns, and found fault with them in one or two matters. A polite answer was however sent by the Hibernian Bible Society, but the only observation as to the Irish Bible is in two short sentences. After saying, "But as you appear to have fallen into a mistake on two points, we take the liberty of alluding to them." They add, "The former of these is regarding the Irish version; as to which we would beg to refer you to the correspondence of the Hibernian Bible Society with the Committee of the Edinburgh Bible Society, on this very subject." This correspondence, however, was not sent to me, and I never saw any part of it, until H. M. M.'s Article, for it was never, that I know of, printed, or circulated in any way. The letter ended by saying, "As a member of the Society, you can have access to the documents alluded to." As I knew however already all that could be said by H. M. M. in defence of this "*Do Penance*" Version, I never went to see this fallacious document, which he states was drawn up by himself, with the assistance or sanction of one or two others, who knew nothing of Irish.

In this matter I may therefore joy too, with "*the testimony of a good conscience*," but it is obvious, that I got no satisfaction, by the mere reference to *HIS* or *THEIR* reply to Edinburgh, of which no copy was sent to me. Honest, candid minds, reading the past pages as to "*Aithrige*," or "*PENANCE*," will acknowledge, that my mind cannot change, until its arguments are overset. Sophistry, pretended etymology, appeal to the authority of names, cannot do it. H. M. M. therefore for once says right, when he adds, "*I presume, therefore, that he has the objection still on his mind.*"

Let the public however be aware, that almost all asserted, done, not done, mis-done or undone, as to the Irish Bible, of late years, apparently by either Irish Society or Hibernian B. S. has been in reality H. M. M.'s work almost alone, or with the assistance of one or two other members, who knew little more of Irish than its letters. The other Members of both Committees, except perhaps two or three on each, not knowing even the Irish letters, were led by his asserted or supposed knowledge of the language,* into lending their names to his statements, suggestions, publications, and plans. This assertion as to the Irish Society, I make, as for the greater number of years of its existence among the most active of its Committee, and even one of its originators in 1816; the latter assertion I make, as having since read the proceedings book of the H. B. S.'s Committee and of its Irish Bible publication Sub-committee, as to this very matter, and also from conversation with various of its members.

But H. M. M. has justified the use of the word "*Aithrige*," in the Irish Bible, to the Edin. B. S.'s Committee, by saying, that "we observe, that the same word, or a word from the same root, and bearing the same signification, (see late Gaelic Dictionary); and the same form of expression, "*make or do repentance*," is employed in the Gaelic Bible, printed for your Society, and issued under its auspices this very year." What a mass of assertions totally contrary to the fact! I have already shown, that "the same word" viz. "*Aithrige*" is never in a single instance used "in the Gaelic New Testament; and if any one will look, he will find that the Old Test. uniformly gives the same result. I have proved, that both use only the noun "*Aithreachas*;" that here this is not "bearing the same signification," never being used in Ireland for "Penance;" that various Dictionaries state the contrary of what H. M. M. asserted; that the Irish word "*Ἀἵτις*" is used a thousand times in Dictionaries, Catechisms, Sermons and Conversations, for "*Penance*," in Ireland, for once that is used for "*Repentance*;" I have proved, too that he might have used various other words, that would not have been like its ambiguous. This

* The Criticism, just published, by Mr. Owen Connellan, on the Irish Grammars, which he and Mr. O'Donovan, who had also criticised it, say was written by this author, has totally demolished it, and exposed the greatest degree of ignorance probably, that was ever shown by any one, who pretended to write the grammar of any tongue. (26 Feb. 1864.)

paper proves that the Gaelic Bible much more commonly employs in preference, the phrase "gabhairm aithreachas," "I receive repentance," and not near so often even the phrase "deanaim aithreachas," "I make or do repentance," as H. M. M. asserts; and finally by it is proved that "Do Penance," ("deanuidh aithrige") is never used in the Gaelic Bible at all. I next therefore come to what he says, about "a word from the same root" being used. Now let us grant for a moment, that "Aithrige," and "aithreachas," are from the same root; Does this prove they have the same meaning? He might as well assert, that my *cognomen*, being *Orpen*, might properly be translated by the Latin words *Vel Penna*, and that of course my prime ancestor must have been a quill-driver, unless from my *prænomen* being *Charles Edward* he may prove, that I am a *metempsychosis* of the *Protender*; or argue that because every cloistered priest, or ignorant monk, is called by the same name as the famous General Monk, who restored King Charles the Second, therefore every shaveling Friar, or Discalceated Cordelier, or Mendicant Capuchin, was created Duke of Albemarle. He might as well maintain, that every one, bearing the name of Tailor, Mason, or Smith, was fit only to be an adept at the snip and needle, the goose and thimble, the trowel and mortar, or the hammer and anvil; like their ancestors, who first got these names from these useful trades.

It is quite manifest, that the first syllable is the same in "Aithrige" and in "aithreachas," viz. "ait, or aith, or ath," but even the same syllable in two words often comes from different roots, as in *bullet* and *bulldog*; and it is much more manifest that the other syllables are quite different. The following quotations from O'Brien's Dictionary, (1st Edit.) will I think prove, that the syllable "aith" or "ath," means usually; as stated before, "after," "back," or "re."

- p. 17, Column 2. "Aithbhéodham, to revive." "Aithbhéodhadh, Do."
 p. 18, Column 1. "Aithéallach, a second proof."
 "Aithéirge, resurrection." "Aiseirge, Do." "Aithéirgim, to rise from the dead."
 "Aithghenim, to regenerate." "Aithghenaimhain, a regeneration."
 p. 19, Column 1. "Aithris, an imitation." "Aithris, a report."
 p. 404, Column 2. "Ria, intelligence, knowledge."
 p. 19, Column 1. "Aithrisim, to report." "Aithristeach, a rehearser, a relater,"
 "Aithscríobhadh, to translate, to copy."
 p. 18, Column 2. "Aithmheal, REPENTANCE, an after sorrow."
 p. 344, Column 2. "Méala, grief, sorrow; mór an méala a bhás, his death is a cause of great grief,"
 "ath—mhéala, REPENTANCE, recanting."
 p. 19, Column 1. "Aithreadh, and aithreachas, REPENTANCE."

Hence it is very manifest, that the last syllables of "aithreadh, aithreachas, aithrige," &c. may come from totally different roots, although the first syllable may mean "after, back, or re," in all of them. I have already shown the derivation of "aithrige," from "aith" "after" and "rige" "a reproof," but these etymological discussions are of little comparative moment. It is beyond all dispute, that "Aithrige" is the general word used for centuries past, and still in Ireland, for "Penance" chiefly, and therefore it should never have been used in the Bible for "Repentance," and should now rather be expunged, like the Brazen Serpent, which as soon as abused to purposes of error, was broken in pieces, and called "*Nehushtan*," or "a piece of Brass," by good and honest Hezekiah. (See 2 Kings xviii. 4.)

One point, in my intended proof of the innumerable errors of the Irish Bible, has now been sufficiently illustrated; namely, as to the single important term "*Repentance*," and its allied words, as far at least as Schmid's Greek Concordance, and Cruden's English one enabled me to trace them out, for there is no printed Irish Concordance in existence; nor can any be made, until the translation of the Bible is first corrected; as otherwise it would perpetuate error, and soon also become useless. I mentioned before my intention, if permitted, (as I was invited by the first Critic, and indeed defied, in page 494, lines 11—16, to "give the public, (through our pages,

if he pleases,) a few of those hundreds of instances of negligence, ignorance and error, which, he says, could be pointed out,"*) to prosecute, with a similarly minute scrutiny and research, several words of equal moment, through every text in which they occur, both in the Old and New Testament; and thus to expose other as great errors.

In the haste, necessary in order to get this paper fairly re-written by a clerk, for a work published at periodical times, after first making the requisite extracts from books, and next to get most of it printed in a hurry, it is very probable, that there may be many mistakes, especially in the Greek and Irish words, typography and accents, &c. :—Some of the mis-spelling, however, of Irish words, existed in the MS. or printed works, which I have quoted. These I have therefore in general tried to copy "*literatim*," even in their misgraphs or misprints.

I find that I shall be obliged, both from want of time and of room, to omit the Note, as to other Irish Dictionaries, and the additional proofs, from other works, as to the word "*Aithrige*" or "*Penance*," with a few supplementary matters, which I could not well bring into the body of this paper. They can wait for a future reply to any attack in this.

I have however only gone over a small part of H. M. M's paper. It is my intention to follow up this article, by a series of similar ones, so as not to leave a single mis-statement unrefuted, not one fallacious argument standing, not one unjust insinuation or covert charge, or direct accusation against myself and Dr. Fitzgerald, or Mr. Thaddæus Connellan, unrebuted; for it shall never be with my consent, that your Journal shall contain such unfounded assertions,* without the same work being supplied also with a full and sufficient antidote.

* To prevent the possibility of your readers doubting what I asserted, in Note*, on page 13, as to H. M. M's disingenuous quotation of the Kingscourt Roman Catholic Scholars' and Masters' Resolution, I subjoin the following parallel, exhibiting that Resolution,

1st. As quoted by H. M. M. in "The Chr. Exam." for September, 1833, No. XXII. Vol. II. (New Series) p. 625, 626.

N.B. All the words, in the opposite column, which are printed in *Italics*, and which prove my argument and disprove his, are most ingeniously and intentionally omitted, except "And," "find it," and "and," by his mode of inserting the query, "And what is the verdict of this national inquest, &c.?"!!! A national inquest indeed!!! One will be held on his and my publications shortly as to this matter.

2nd. As quoted in "Reasons and Authorities and Facts, afforded by the history of the Irish Society; respecting the duty of employing the Irish Language, as a more general medium for conveying Scriptural instruction to the Native Peasantry of Ireland," by Henry Jos. Monck Mason, L.L.D. "Secretary to the Irish Society, Dublin: (First Ed.) Printed by M. Goodwin, 29, Denmark-street, 1829." 8vo. pages 34. See page 22, lines 4—16 from the bottom, (See it also in Chr. Examr. (Old Series) Vol. II. No. X. April, 1826, p. 324. 2nd Column, lines 16—36 from bottom.)

"Objections having been made to our reading the Irish Testament, from its not being a proper translation, we have individually and collectively, in a very minute and accurate manner, with our Irish Dictionaries in our hands, compared it with both the Protestant and Rhemish translations. "And what is the verdict of this national inquest, thus deliberately holden? It is that they find to be an "accurate Irish translation, with the exception of a few orthographical and typographical errors."

N.B. The Priests had objected to their reading the Scriptures at all, even in Irish, and they drew up these Resolutions as an answer, to shew it was right to use what agreed with "their own Rhemish Version." The Resolution in the Christian Examiner, of 1836, puts "its being an improper translation" and omits "our" before "reading" and puts "receive the better one," for "receive the better," and "is provided" for "be provided."

(From want of room on page *171, as shewn in the Note on it, I was obliged to postpone this Note until this page. Since the passage to which that Note referred was written, I have examined all the texts of the Old Testament, in Cruden's Concordance, in which the noun "*Repentance*," the participle "*Repenting*," or the different parts of the verb "*Repent*," are used in reference to GOD; and I find, that the Irish Version uses "*Aithreachas*," in the following texts; Exod. xxxii. 14; Numb. xliii. 19; Deut. xxxii. 36;

"3d. Resolved—That objections having been made to our reading the Irish Testament, from its not being a proper translation, we have individually and collectively, in a very minute and accurate manner, with our Irish Dictionaries in our hands, compared it with both the Protestant and Rhemish translations, and find it throughout most agreeing with our own Rhemish Version, and to be an accurate Irish translation, with the exception of a few orthographical and typographical errors; however if those condemning it, convince us of its errors, and supply us with a better translation, we (as is our duty) will thankfully receive the better; but, until this better one be provided for us, we cannot give up that, which the Irish Society have been graciously pleased to provide, especially as we are convinced of its being free from radical errors."

The Second Edition of the above work, in 1832, has the same words on the same page.

H. M. M.'s statements, too, never shall remain as matter of true history, as to the Irish Bible, its Versions or Editions, in the pages of the Christian Examiner. I have prepared the substance of the remainder of my answer, and as this you will, I think, admit, has sufficiently discussed the question as to "Aithrighe," so the rest will as fully settle other matters not less important.

I trust that nothing that I have said will give annoyance to the other Committee Members of the Bible or Irish Society; I exonerate nearly all of them from blame in this matter, except for allowing themselves to be misled, and I am convinced also, that these bodies never sanctioned the first Critic's anonymous abuse, nor even H. M. M.'s unjustifiable attack on me and others, nor allowed him to misstate as to private letters of mine, in their possession, which they had never in any way published. It never was our intention, to mention the names of any individuals or of any Societies, nor to give them any trouble. These nameless critics did mention both, and have thus forced us. We wanted merely to aid Mr. T. Connellan in his invaluable labours, and to find out whether the public would be likely to assist us in doing so; but more especially in getting the Irish Version made as perfect, at least, as the authorised English one, and in providing an Irish Concordance and Irish singing Psalms, of which the poor feel the want, and we see the importance more and more every day.

Believe me to be your willing servant and friend, in this cause, and in all such,
CHARLES EDW. HERBERT ORPEN, M.D.

11, North Great George's-street, Dublin. 10th September, 1833.

Judges ii. 18; 1 Sam. xv. 29; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; Pa. xc. 13; cvl. 45; cx. 4; cxxx. 14; Jerem. xv. 6; xviii. 8, 10; xx. 16; xxvi. 3, 13; Ezek. xxiv. 14; Hosea xl. 8; xlii. 14; Amos vii. 3, 6; Jonah iii. 10; iv. 2; Joel ii. 1, 3. It uses "Aithreach," in the following. Gen. vi. 6, 7; 1 Sam. xv. 11, 29, 35; 1 Chron. xxi. 13; Jerem. iv. 28; xxvi. 19; xlii. 10; Zech. vii. 14. The word used in Exod. xxxii. 12, is "daonuidh." In one text, where not repentance, but non-repentance appears to be ascribed to GOD, viz: Jerem. xx. 16, the Irish Bible, applies "dearna aithrighe," in the phrase, "agus nach dearna aithrighe," to God, but as the word "dearna," which is a perfect of "deanam," is used in all persons and numbers, on some occasions, and as this very phrase "agus nach dearna aithrighe," is used in a plural sense, as to many men, in 2 Cor. xii. 21, it is very possible, that many readers, from not observing the context, and not seeing any singular pronoun affixed, may refer the phrase to the antecedent plural cities "which God destroyed," and think it was they, which did not "do penance;" and not to the antecedent singular "God," who destroyed them and did not repent of it; which seems to be the sense of the Hebrew. The only texts, in the Old Testament, in which "Man" is said to "Repent," are the following, viz: "Aithreachas" in Exod. xlii. 17; Judges xxi. 6, 15; Job xlii. 6; Jerem. vii. 6; xxxi. 19; "Aithreach" in Jonah iii. 9; and "Aithrighe" only in 1 Kings vii. 47; Ezek. xiv. 6; Joel ii. 14. In the second of which texts alone, "deanuidh aithrighe," or "do go penance," appears.

In the Gaelic Old Testament, I find, that the words which correspond to the English words "Repent," "Repentance," &c. are as follows.—REpent is AITHREACHAS, in Exod. xlii. 17; gu'n bi aithreachas; xxxii. 12; Pa. xc. 13, gabh aithreachas; Num. xxi. 19; 1 Sam. xv. 29, gu'n gabhaidh e aithreachas; Deut. xxxii. 36; Pa. cxxx. 14; Ezek. xiv. 6; xviii. 30; gabhaidh e aithreachas; 1 Sam. xv. 29; Pa. ex. 4, cha gabh e aithreachas; 1 Kings vii. 47, ni lad aithreachas; Job xlii. 6; ni mi aithreachas, Jer. iv. 28; cha gabh mi aithreachas, xviii. 3, gu'n gabh mise aithreachas, xxvi. 12, gabhaidh—athreachas. Joel ii. 14; Jonah iii. 9, gabh e aithreachas. REpent is AITHREACH, only in Jer. xlii. 10, is aithreach nam. REPENTANCE is AITHREACHAS, in Hosea xli. 14; bith aithreachas. REPENTED is AITHREACHAS, in Exod. xxxii. 14; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16; Jer. xxvi. 16; Jud. xxi. 6, 15; Amos vii. 3, 6; Jonah iii. 10; gabh—athreachas, 1 Chron. xxi. 16; Psalm cvi. 43; Jer. xx. 16; gabh e aithreachas, Jer. vii. 6, cha'n 'eil aithreachas; Jer. xxxi. 19, gabh mi aithreachas; Zech. vii. 14, do gabh mi aithreachas. REPENTED is AITHREACH, in Gen. vi. 6; 1 Sam. xv. 35, b'aithreach leis. REPENTED is TRUAS, in Judges ii. 18, gabh—truas. REPENTEST is AITHREACHAS, in Jonah iv. 2, gabh thu aithreachas. REPENTETH is AITHREACHAS, in Joel ii. 13, gabhaidh e aithreachas. REPENTETH is AITHREACH, in Gen. vi. 7; 1 Sam. xv. 11, is aithreach leam. REPENTINO is AITHREACHAS, in Jer. xv. 6, do gabhaidh aithreachas. REPENTINGS is the plural of AITHREACHAS, in Hosea xl. 8, tha m'aithreachas.

It is evident, therefore, that neither "Aithrighe," nor "Deanuidh Aithrighe," are ever used in the Gaelic Old Testament;—in every instance also, except one, in which "Truas" occurs, and about five, in which "Aithreach" occurs, it is "Aithreachas," which is used, viz. about forty times, and almost every where, viz. about thirty-five times it is the verb "gabhaim," which is united with it and not "deanam." Parts of the verb "to be" are used about nine times; and but about three times, any parts of those tenses, which are commonly called parts of the verb "deanam," but are really parts of other verbs. Hence too it is evident, that the Irish Old Testament resembles much more the Gaelic, in the use of "Aithreachas" than the New; for "aithrighe" occurs but three times in the Irish Old Testament, whereas in the New, it is "aithreachas" that occurs only a few times, as shewn in the table in the preceding pages of this reply.

APPENDIX.

MANY of the kind friends, to whom I entrusted proofs of this paper, for their advice and correction, as explained in the "*Prefatory Postscript*," having obliged me by observations, on various things in it, I have, in correcting the press, adopted almost all of their suggestions, that were at all practicable or compatible with each other. I subjoin a few observations, in reference to some other remarks, just copying the principal of their notes, which I could not adopt, adding one or two explanations as to each, and merely saying, that these remarks on these minor matters confirm my conviction, that all the main arguments are well founded, and cannot be answered.

One most important paper, however, just received from one of the first Gaelic Scholars in the world, which confirms every material part of what I have stated or asserted, I reserve for a reply to any attack on this paper.

Page 149, as to Shaw's Dictionary, *Objection*.—"These two words, "*breath-Aithrige*," as I conceive, mean Penance; but it does not appear that *Ἀἵτριγε*, by itself, has this signification, in the modern sense of the word "*penance*" at least." *Answer*. The modern sense, among Papists, is exactly the same, that it has been these thousand years. But that "*aithrige*" did and does mean Penance I have already proved, for I have quoted in the paper many passages, in which Roman Catholics use it in their sense of it, and have given their precise definitions of it. But as to this quotation from Shaw's Dictionary, the reader will find in Donlevy's and other Popish Irish Catechisms, that they use "*breath aithrige*," or "*breath aithrige*" or "*breathannas aithrige*," or "*breithannas aithrige*," which all mean the same, *only*, when they are speaking of the particular sentence of penance, to be performed, as commanded after confession and absolution. The words "*breath*," &c. in every Dictionary meaning "*sentence*," "*judgment*," "*injunction*." The meaning of the two words together therefore is never "*penance*" simply, but "*an injunction of penance*," or "*a penance-sentence*," or "*a sentence of penance*," or "*a penance enjoined*," or "*a penance imposed*;" and it is the word "*aithrige*" alone, that by itself or in this phrase means "*penance*," as in Donlevy's expression, which I quoted in page 168, viz. "*dó*" (*δευοναρι*) "*penance*" (*Ἀἵτριγε* alone) "*openly, according to the custom of the country*," where it is impossible any one can say it can mean "*to repent*," which would make nonsense of the statement; by saying, repentance varied according to the custom of each country, as Penance notoriously does. I could give many more similar phrases, to prove that it is "*aithrige*" itself, that means "*penance*" in the strict Popish sense, as distinct from, and more or less than "*repentance*," and that it means it without "*breath*" annexed, and that the two words always mean more. But I shall reserve these proofs for a reply to any attack on this paper.

P 150, as to M'Curtin's Dictionary.—"*breath-Aithrige*." As to M'Curtin's Dictionary making "*Penance*:" *breath-Aithrige*," one friend remarked, that there is no comma between them, but M'Curtin is only speaking of the Penance ordered, and not of Penance by itself, or as a sacrament, and my friend should in the next line have remarked too, that "*Penitence*" is "*Ἀἵτριγε Ἀἵτριγε*," without any stop between them. Yet no one will say that these two words, are used by him, only to mean "*Penitence*" when united. As I found no commas between the words in his Dictionary, in either line, I left them so in both cases, that no one might say I perverted quotations as others did; but the fact is, that he leaves out commas and stops very often; for example, under the word "*impenitence*," M'Curtin puts "*neamh-aithrige cruad éirídear*" without any stop between them; and yet no one will say, that the whole three words must be always used together. I have already shown, that Stapleton's Catechism and other works use on the contrary "*neamh-aithreas*" in preference for "*impenitence*," and "*aithreas*" for "*repentance*" or "*penitence*;" and I have proved that it must always happen, that whatever word Roman Catholics use commonly for "*Penance*," they will use sometimes for "*Repentance*" too, and its negative for "*Impenitence*;" but that there is no proof at all, that they ever use in Ireland "*aithreas*" to mean "*penance*," and that there is no reason, why we, who do not include Penance in "*Repentance*," should use either the positive or the negative form of the dubious and ambiguous words "*aithrige*" and "*neamh-aithrige*." In the same way, let the reader observe, in p. 155, as to Walsh's Dictionary, that the last remark applies to it also but he should also observe, that the first word, that Walsh puts for "*Resipiscencia*," though he was a Papist, is *Ἀἵτριγε*.

P. 156, as to Lhuys's Archaeologica.—One friend says, "*King* was no Friar, but a Clergyman of the Church of England; he had been a Priest, but I believe a secular Priest in the Church of Rome."

If my readers will look in Lhuys, p. 311, section 1, to which I already referred them they will find, that Lhuys does call King, as I said he did, "*Friar King*," and he did so also in another part of his book, which I did not copy, and cannot therefore now quote from memory. I did not, as my friend implies, say that King was a Friar. I knew him to have been a Priest till he was an old man; but am not sure that he was a Friar, though I believe he was, and think he had no parish until after he professed himself a Protestant; but I quoted Lhuys as calling him a Friar, in the passage to which I referred, which he does beyond all doubt, as any one will find who looks, and other writers I believe do the same.

P. 156 as to the Popish definition of Penance the same friend remarks—"Is there any word in Irish, which could be used with propriety in every place, where *Ἀἵτριγε* now occurs, and which would not be liable to this same objection?"

I reply, Is there any one compound word in any language which can be used in every place, to translate a compound word in another language, wherever it occurs? But I do not believe, that any one can produce an instance, in which "*aithreas*" is used in Ireland to

mean "penance." I do not mean to say, that "*aithreachas*" should be used in every instance for *μετανῶν*, *μεταμέλομαι*, and all their compounds, as the Gaelic Bible does uniformly, and I think very erroneously, but I am very sure that in Ireland "aithrige" never should be so used. Besides, I do not believe, that the word *μετάνοια* contains in it the idea of sorrow at all. This you will find proved in Geoghegan's Xenophon's Cyropaedia, lib. 1, chap. 3, page 6 at bottom, 2nd Edit. 1823, Dublin, where it means merely "change of mind" or "of opinion," as Xenophon's use of it there puts beyond all dispute. See the passage with "*ἐν τούτῳ δὲ πηγαῖα ζῆλον αἰτάνει*" in it, as it is decisive. I rather think, that Homer never uses either *μετανῶν* or *μεταμέλομαι*. The latter does imply careful regret, but the former never I believe by itself, either in profane or sacred Greek.

P. 156.* As to Crabb's Dictionary the same friend says, that he conceives the commas between "breath" or "breathavous," and "aithrige" are wrong, but he omits to observe that it is perfectly indifferent whether the commas were put by Crabb by mistake or not, as he translates the two phrases "breath aithrige" and "breathavous aithrige" by "i.e. the penance imposed" so that it is of no moment, whether they are put in or not, as the translation must be that which he gave, as I quoted it, for the two phrases, viz. "*id est*" not penance merely, but "the penance imposed." Certainly "*aithrige*" does not ever mean "*imposed*," therefore it is the other word that does.

P. 156.* As to Crabb's Dictionary, the same friend has marked the following passage:—

Eng. I begin to repent of what I had said;	Eng. I do not at all repent of it;
Lat. Pœnitentiam agere sermonis mei corpi;	Lat. Haud muto factum;
Irish. Ta haithreach liom mo ghlorthaidh;	Irish. Ní haithreach liom é ar canchóir;
Do bhl aithreachus oram sam 'chaint;	Ní dóilighas ar bith oram uime;
	Ní aithreachas ar canchóir;

but I do not know for what reason, as it is a passage clearly in my favour.

P. 157, as to the first sentence, the same friend says—"Did the English word "*Penance*" signify what we now call its Popish sense in the reign of James 1st? To which I reply, that we do not live in the reign of James the 1st, but of William the 4th, and must use words or distasteful words, according to the true or false or altered sense, in which they are now understood, and not according to their meaning 300 years ago, or in another century. Before James VI of Scotland became James I of England, he probably attached different meanings to some words, according to Scottish use, from what he afterwards came to find attached to them in English use, and that in a few years time. Words in different countries and different centuries have different and changed meanings. We must not now speak in the words of Wickliffe, if we mean to be understood. But in addition, I say, that the word "*Penance*" among Papists never at any time meant "*Repentance*," in the Protestant sense, but always either more or less.

P. 158, as to the last paragraph, the same friend says—"Is it not true, that Penance, in the sense in which the Papists use the word, when they speak of it as a Sacrament, includes more than what we now mean by it when we speak of it as objectionable?" It means more and less, and hence the danger of using "*aithrige*," which is put in all their Catechisms for "*Penance*." Besides I have quoted their own definitions of its meaning in three Catechisms, (and surely they know their own minds and meanings), by which it is proved, that it does always include more than is of the essence of Repentance, and never does include all that is of the essence of Repentance; and therefore we should not use one for the other. I have quoted three Popish Catechisms already, and could easily multiply the number, fixing the five things contained in Penance, the latter two of which are, 1st, confession only to a Romish Priest and his papal absolutiou, and 2nd, satisfaction and atonement to God and our neighbour.

P. 158. The same friend says, "these words (*respicite, corrigite, convertimini, penitentini*) can none of them be used uniformly throughout the New Testament for *μετάνοια*, and its derivatives." To be sure they cannot; but can any one Latin word or words be used uniformly for this or any other compound Greek word in every passage? But observe, that the marked exclusion of "*agite Pœnitentiam*," and its translations, from almost all, if not every new Latin and other translation, made by the Reformers, in every country of Europe, is a clear argument in my favour, that it, or any similarly abused term in any language, is always a dangerous one to continue to use to Papists; but the fact is, that *μετάνοια*, and its derivatives, never in any age of the world could be correctly translated by "*actio pœnitentia*," &c. &c. the latter word always implying "painful sorrow," which the Greek word does not imply at all. It may just as often be a joyful change as a sorrowful change of mind, and as connected with believing the Gospel, should be always joyful.

P. 160.* as to the first paragraph, the same friend says, "Is there a single word in the Latin, which would express repentance, as distinguished from the modern meaning of Penance? See Faccoliati."

Did the heathen Romans perform penance in the modern Romish sense of it, by confession to a Popish Priest, for this is essential in Penance, and his absolution? The modern meaning of Penance among Papists is the same, it was hundreds of years ago. God pleased to reveal his will by Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek words, and not by Latin, (which was only used by an enemy, in Christ's sentence on the cross, inadvertently speaking truth,) and therefore what God meant us to understand by his words, are the ideas that the Hebrew and Greek words contain, and if Latin or any tongue were even proved defective in a single word, we should use two, but these two certainly should translate correctly *μετάνοια* and never should express more or less than that; for *μετάνοια* related to a change of mind solely and does not necessarily imply "icksome feelings," (or external bodily "penance")

at all,) but quite as frequently the contrary. When the Bible says, "Repent and believe the Gospel," it does not mean "and let affliction break your heart," but, "rejoice in the good news."

P. *165, as to Boyle, Marsh and Bedell, the same friend says, "These two paragraphs should be omitted, as having nothing to do with the question, and as injurious to the character of two most excellent men. Mr. Boyle and Abp. Marsh (as also Bp. Bedell,) were of course desirous of having the Apocrypha translated into Irish, because they were connected with the Protestant Episcopal Church in which the Apocrypha is revered, and read for the daily lessons in the Church service. If the Church service was to be read in Irish, the people could not properly join in it without the Apocrypha."

This appears to me to prove precisely what I said, and to show that these most excellent men were all not clear, in the duty of excluding altogether the Apocrypha from mixture with revelation. I have no objection to the Apocrypha being translated into any Language, as a mere collection of historical books and legendary tales, but no Church should use it in its public services, along with inspired books, and yet none is a more firm churchman than myself. The direction to read it in our Church was originally a grievous error, but the permission to substitute other chapters for it is a proof, that its admission at all was doubtful even to those who arranged the lessons.

P. *169, 170*. Another friend remarks that the Rheinish version uses "*repentance*" in Acts v. 31; xl. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 25; Heb. xii. 17; and not "*penance*," and that therefore as the Irish version uses "*aithrige*" in these places, the latter has not so contracted a meaning as the word "*Penance*." This appears to me a complete *non sequitur*, as it was not the same person who translated both; I regret very much that I did not insert a column in these pages for the Douay Version, as it would have much strengthened what I said.—But my friend forgot, that the question is not, whether the word "*aithrige*," is not sometimes used even by Romanists for "*repentance*" but whether it is not the word, that they invariably use for "*penance*," and whether it does not occur in the latter sense a thousand times for once in the former, and whether "*aithreachas*" is ever used in Ireland, except to mean "*Repentance*."

ERRATA.

- P. 150* Line 6 from bottom, for "next" read "this."
 —*151 — 9 — top, for "this page" read "page 150*"
 — — — last, for "6" read "150*"
 — 152* — 6 — top, for "7" read "150*"
 — 154* — 3 — top, dot the "3" of "ΔΙΤΗΙΣΕΑΪ;"
 for "ΔΙ" read "Δ3;" for "ΔΟ" read "ΔΟ."
 — 4 — top, for "F15" read "FΕΑΠ;" for
 "ΔΕΑΠ" read "ΔΕΑΠ."
 — 6 — top, "mo" read "no," dot the "c" of
 "CΠΟΙΔΕ."
 — 6 — top, dot the "c" of "CΠΟΙΔΕ," for
 "CΠ" read "FΩP;" undot the "r" of "CΑΠCΑΠΠΕ."
 P. 164* Line 12 from top, for "*possibly*" read "*properly*."

This word was inadvertently copied, "*possibly*," by the clerk, who made a fair copy for the printer, from my manuscript, in which it was "*properly*," as in H. M. M.'s paper. The printer of course put "*possibly*" in the proofs, in which this page was numbered 20. As soon as it was pointed out to me, I marked it to be corrected, with various other errata. As however, one of the answers to my paper, which I have seen in print already, before this paper is published, and which was written as a reply to a proof copy, which was entrusted in confidence to its author, as explained in the "*Prefatory Postscript*," dwells upon this Erratum, as if it were intentional, I have left it, lest I should prevent his publication of the paper, and deprive him of such a theme for attacking me, or even give him the trouble to alter his types. This page 164, corresponds, except alterations, with the page 20 of the proof.

P. 169* Luke xv. 7. should be the same as Luke xv. 10, which follows, viz. "ΔΕ ΣΥΝ ΔΙΤΗΙΣΕ," and not "ΠΙΔΩΔΑΠΑΤ ΔΙΤΗΙΣΕ," which phrase occurring also in verse 7, was inadvertently put under ΜΕΤΑΝΩΣΩ on this page, instead of under ΜΕΤΑΝΩΣΑ, on p. *169.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,

AND

Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXXI.

MAY, 1834.

VOL. III.

O'BRIEN'S SERMONS ON JUSTIFICATION.*

It was the great Primate Ussher, we believe, who used to say to his clergy, "It will take all your learning to make things plain." A remark, the broad principle of which, we wish from our hearts had been more generally attended to, and that especially by the divines of our own church.

The man who enters the Christian ministry with an unprovided mind, (supposing him even to a certain extent pious and well-meaning,) shows himself, *in limine*, little acquainted, indeed, with the peculiar nature of the duties which are to devolve on him. It is true that the great primary elements of Christian doctrine are, like other productions of their great Author, magnificent in their simplicity; and carry on them the impress of combined wisdom, power, and goodness; working, as they do, vast results, by means the plainest, most direct, and uncomplicated; so that it is said of the systematic teaching of Christ's school, "A wayfaring man shall not err therein." But these elemental truths have to be separated from out a huge heap of rubbish, which the pride, and fraud, and ignorance of mankind have at various periods contrived to throw upon them. They

* An attempt to explain and establish the doctrine of Justification by Faith only; in Ten Sermons upon the Nature and the Effects of Faith. By James Thomas O'Brien, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, and Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity, in the University of Dublin. London, 1833.

have to be contradistinguished from numerous lying forgeries which would usurp their name, and place, and power; they have to be proved, enforced, and maintained in their integrity against the influences of misconception and misrepresentation. He who supposes, then, that human learning has not its uses, and those important ones, in the adequate discharge of the pastoral office, errs most grievously. It is no less a mistake, however, to conclude that mere learning, as such, can supply the want of piety in the Christian teacher; or that any degree of acquaintance, however extensive, with language and with science, will enable a man to fulfil the duties of a minister in the Church, when knowledge is not subordinated to the great end of promoting the cause of the Gospel. How many of our divines, of high intellectual attainments, have lived and died uselessly, from want of making such attainments ancillary to the truth as it is in Jesus! Who can look round upon the shelves of any extensive library of divinity and not see evidences

“Thick as leaves in Vallambrosa's shade,”

of the melancholy misapplication of learning and talent. What tractates of tediousness, and folios of folly. A whole *apparatus biblicus* exhausted upon the question about “the thundering legion,” or a poor creature going down to his grave in peace, satisfied that he has well discharged his duty, because leaving to posterity the result of years of profound philological speculations upon the Jewish *Hin* and *Epha*.

There can scarcely, then, be presented to a well-instructed mind a more gratifying sight than that of a minister of religion learned, in the proper sense of the term, and applying high powers to high ends; exhibiting himself active and earnest about the salvation of men's souls, and manifesting that activity and energy, accompanied by every adventitious help of inborn talent and acquired literary endowment. What a pleasure it is to see an instructed scribe come forth in the panoply of a well-ordered intellect, and with a flourish or two of his good sword sweep away a tribe of those drivelling sciolists, who keep such a pattering upon their *tom toms*, and braying upon their horns around the gates of the temple of reason, as though they alone had right of access. We devoutly believe, that from no class of persons, almost, has the cause of true religion suffered more than from some of your Doctors of Divinity. Not men, either, who have graduated in the schools of Salamanca or of Lorraine, but persons who have walked the halls of Protestant colleges, and learned their theology amid the cloistered shades which stretch along the Isis and the Cam, or under the porticoes of that University whose seal informs us that she is still but “*juxta* Dublin.” It is pleasant, then, to see a genuine Doctor coming forward, rightly equipped, and upon the right side. It is pleasant to see a man entitled to the scarlet robes and other apparellings of the highest degree upon the academical scale,

putting forth his powers in the cause of that "faith once delivered to the Saints." There can be no sneerings here about want of talent, learning, acquaintance with the subject, &c. &c., or as to how far differently matters would appear, "if treated by men of critical acquaintance with the originals, metaphysical ability, extensive research," and so forth. The book, whose title graces the commencement of this review, has abundant claims upon the score of scholarship, as well as of the cause in which that scholarship is enlisted. No tassel-hatted Grecian, no hooded Hebraist can attempt to frown contempt upon those lubrications. James O'Brien, D.D., is manifestly quite at home in all such matters as the erudite would lay most stress on. He is not a man to be overwhelmed by an allusion to the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and of the Seventy. The names of Alter and Kypke, Griesbach, Vater, "et hoc genus omne," glisten upon his notes. He flagellates Bishop Bull with Theodotion & Origen's tetrapla, and shows himself not only conversant with the pages of Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, Cranmer, Jewel, Tyndale, &c. &c., but (who would believe it?) better acquainted with Cardinals Bellarmine and Cajetan than even Archbishop Lawrence himself.

The discourses which constitute the subject of our present considerations were delivered in the Chapel of Trinity College, and with a view specially to the impressing the minds of the students with a sense of the importance of the great doctrine of justification by faith only. We well remember the deep interest they excited during the course of their delivery, and the anxiety so generally expressed for their being published. It was with exceeding pleasure we heard of their appearance in print, and we think the Christian public, in whose hands they now are, will unite with us in sentiments of satisfaction. To have a doctrine of such magnitude handled by one so well qualified to do so, was of great consequence. And certainly, if, as Luther justly expresses it, it be "*articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*," we hail it as a bright omen that it should have been made thus prominent at such a time; in such a place; and by such a man. The plan adopted by Mr. O'Brien cannot be better expressed than by reference to his own words in the preface:—

"I begin by attempting (Sermons I. and II.) to ascertain the scriptural meaning of *Faith*; how the principle is wrought in the mind; and what is the whole preceding or accompanying change of mind which is essential to the existence of genuine faith. I next seek, (Sermon III.) in the same way, to fix the sense of *Justification* in the Bible: and then to determine (Sermon IV.) what is the connexion which the Scriptures declare to exist between this change of mind, which God has wrought in us, and this change of our condition before Him. This ends in the establishment of the doctrine of *Justification by Faith only*; with a clear understanding of its meaning. And to this are naturally added, in the way of confirmation, an exposure of the chief corruptions of this doctrine (Sermon V.) and an

answer to the chief corruptions of it (Sermon VI.) Regarding this great truth, then, as sufficiently explained, established, and guarded, I pass, in the remaining Sermons, to a consideration of the other effects of *faith*:—its operation in the sanctification of believers;—how it moves and restrains them; and how it calls into exercise, and sustains, all the other natural forces by which God designs to restrain and to move his people.

“I have found it necessary to add some Notes. They are intended to supply explanations and enforcements of my reasoning, which could not easily be comprised in the Sermons; which, at least, I found myself unable to introduce there, without awkwardness and confusion. But their leading object is to sustain the doctrinal statements of the Discourses, by authorities from the Confessions of the Protestant churches, and the writings of the eminent Protestant divines of the period of the Reformation. They are, in both ways, chiefly fitted to assist or direct students in Divinity: but some of them, and parts of almost all, will be intelligible to any one to whom the Discourses are intelligible; and will interest all whom *they* interest.”

In his first discourse, which is on the Nature of Faith, Dr. O'Brien handles with considerable acuteness the question, so much agitated among some, as to whether saving faith have its seat in the head only or in the heart—whether it be a purely intellectual process, or one connected with the feelings and affections. And he demonstrates, very satisfactorily we think, the truth of the position which would go to seat faith in the heart. This view of the matter (which was ever that to which we ourselves have inclined) would seem indeed necessary, in order to the affixing to faith a moral character, or to render the exercise of it in any degree praiseworthy. We subjoin here an extract or two, which we think will give pleasure. Having stated the various opinions abroad on the matter, and his reasons for dissenting from them, he proceeds:

“Investigating the subject upon sounder principles, in a more patient course, and in an humbler spirit, ye, my brethren, will find, I am persuaded, that the true notion of FAITH, when we are most concerned to ascertain its meaning, is TRUST. That the true meaning, therefore, of *faith in Christ, or in God through Christ*, is not merely or properly belief in the Scripture narrative concerning our Lord; or an assent of the understanding to certain propositions derived from that narrative, however true, and however important they be: but that it is TRUST IN CHRIST, or IN GOD THROUGH CHRIST, founded upon such an assent; an entire and unreserved confidence in the efficacy of what Christ has done and suffered for us; a full reliance upon him and upon his work.”

The above contains, exactly in his own words, Dr. O'Brien's views concerning the Nature of Faith, which views he proceeds to support by showing that, in popular parlance, *faith in a person*, and *trust in him*, are phrases which may be used indifferently; his great appeal, however, is made, as indeed it should

be, to Scripture. We subjoin here, at some length, his arguments, in order to give a specimen of his mode of reasoning, and of his general style :

" But the question about the meaning of a scriptural term must be ultimately determined by an appeal to Scripture. And though I am confined, by the circumstances of this inquiry, to a very limited portion of the Bible, I am persuaded that a fair examination of it will be abundantly sufficient for my purpose. I avoid all reference to the Old Testament, not because it would be difficult to find there the most decisive instances of this use of the term, but because the application of them would require some preliminary discussion unsuited to this place. And from a large proportion of the texts in the New Testament, in which the term occurs, I am also excluded, obviously by the course of investigation which I have laid down. But the remainder will, I think, supply abundant materials, when fairly considered, for the determination of this question.

" The Bible, however, is, as you know, a book of a cast so little formal and didactic, that you can hardly expect to find there regular definitions of the terms employed in it; but must be content, for the most part, to collect their meaning from their use. Of the examination required in the present case, I can, of course, give but an outline: it shall, however, I hope, be defective in few points which there can be any difficulty in supplying. When, for example, you find our Lord thus addressing his disciples, " Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the oven, how much more shall he clothe you, O ye of little *faith* ! " you can have no doubt, I presume, of the sense in which he employs the word *faith*. No one can, I suppose, question that he means by it that confidence in God's protection which the perception of his care for the lowest parts of his creation ought to inspire in his children—in those who should feel that they were objects of warmer love and of tenderer care. A glance at the whole passage will show that it is designed to condemn, in God's servants, all that unreasonable solicitude about life and its wants which they are so prone to indulge—to banish a *doubtful mind* concerning the supply of our necessities, by the recollection that *our heavenly Father knoweth that we have need of these things*. To dispel all vain anxieties and too curious care, not merely by the depressing reflection that they can really do nothing for us, but by the more cheering thought that *we are better* than those animals who are harassed by no such anxieties, nor can exercise any such care, and yet for whom *He who is our Father* amply provides. You will see, that in the reproof which I have quoted, it is so little the Lord's purpose to charge those to whom he speaks with ignorance of God's providential care or disbelief of it, that on the contrary, the justice of his reproof of their want of *faith* rests chiefly upon the impossibility of their being ignorant of, or doubting the facts upon which such confidence in God should be grounded.

" When the wild alarm to which they gave way at the approach of danger draws from him the rebuke, ' Why are ye so *fearful* ? ' ' How is it that ye have no *faith* ? ' or, ' Where is your *faith* ? '—you have plain instances of a similar use of the term. And you all must remember the beautiful inci-

dent that leads to a touching reproof of the apostle Peter, which furnishes a clear example of the same kind. One of the evangelists relates, you remember, that on a stormy night, when his disciples were in the midst of the sea, tossed with waves, the Lord was seen coming to them, walking upon the sea: that when he drew nigh to the ship, and made himself known to them, this ardent follower entreated that he might be commanded to go down to him upon the water; and, being commanded, at once descended. But when he saw himself surrounded by the dangers which he had voluntarily encountered, his heart died within him—his confidence in his Lord's power and in His love, was strong enough to make him dare all perils, but too weak to keep him tranquil in the midst of them; and he cried, 'Lord, save me!' And immediately Jesus stretched forth his hand, and caught him, and said unto him, 'O thou of *little faith*, wherefore didst thou *doubt*?' And to these striking instances, to fix the sense of the word, your own memory will probably add others of the same class.

"Now, on the other hand, look on any of those instances of *faith* which draw forth the Lord's gracious approbation, and analyze the feeling that he commends. Take, for example, the notable case of the Syrophenician woman, whose faith he seems to have regarded as especially worthy of remark, and see in what it consists:—She, believing him to be from God, and invested with miraculous powers to execute his gracious purposes, seeks him out to engage his assistance on behalf of her child, whose disease was beyond all human aid. She is received by him, as you remember, in a way calculated to extinguish all the hopes of relief which she had cherished—'he answered her not a word.' But she perseveres, under this heavy discouragement, in earnestly supplicating his compassion; and when her importunity, at length wrings from him an answer, it is one which to confidence less steadfast would have been a final repulse:—'It is not meet to take the children's bread, and cast it unto dogs.' Her memorable reply, however, shows at once the nature, the foundation, and the strength of the principle which urged her to prayer, and sustained her in it. It showed that she confided in the Ruler of the world, not because she was insensible to the great and perplexing inequalities of human condition which he had established there, but because she had been enabled to see, in all the arrangements of his providence, the gracious character which pervades them all—to see that his tender mercies are over all his works—that he has wisely and kindly accommodated the circumstances to the nature of meaner animals, so as bountifully to provide for the wants of the very lowest of the beings that he has made. Her reply, I say, proves that she had been enabled to discern all this, and enabled too, to draw from all that she saw, that lesson of humble confidence in God which the Lord's touching exposition, to which we have just now adverted, was designed to teach to those who were much more favourably circumstanced for collecting it. 'Truth, Lord,' she replies, 'yet the dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from their master's table.' Is it not the conviction thus affectingly expressed—that however low were the place that she occupied among mankind—however far removed she was from the high privileges which she un-

repiningly saw others enjoying—she was not scorned or neglected by her Creator; but, filling the station assigned her by His wisdom, was still the object, in the proper degree, of which He alone was the proper judge, of His love and care? Is it not manifest, I say, that it is this humble and steadfast confidence in God, formed under circumstances so untoward, and retained under a trial so severe, that moves the admiration and wonder (if we may so speak) which appear in the Lord's reply, 'O woman, great is thy faith!'

"The former instances, rightly considered, not only fix the true nature of the principle, but sufficiently overthrow both the erroneous notions of it. For you see that when the Lord reprehends the want of faith of those to whom he speaks, there is no failure in obedience—no want of belief in any specific proposition proposed as the object of belief—no want of belief in any sense which does not identify belief with trust—it is plainly want of trust that he condemns. But this last instance seems even more conclusive. There his emphatic commendation of faith is drawn forth by no signal act of obedience—by no act of obedience of any kind, and still less by any act of belief as distinguished from trust; it is manifestly, as I have before said, by an exhibition of trust in God, every way deserving of wonder; but of trust, it is to be remarked, not manifested in believing what the Lord said, but in disbelieving it, when, in its apparent sense, it contradicted her views of God's character, and tended to shake her confidence in Him, by representing Him as careless about her sufferings, and indisposed to relieve them. This, then, even more strongly than the former cases, establishes the sense assigned to the word. And if you examine, in the same way, other instances, you will find, I think, just the same elements in the state of mind commended by our Lord under the name of *faith*. Strong desire for some benefit, and a strong hope of receiving it; firm confidence that the Being applied to could and would bestow it, appears in all. But I must leave it to private investigation to establish this; and must pass over all intermediate instances of the use of the word, in the Acts and the Epistles, that we may have for considering a passage which it is impossible to omit, and which seems to render the consideration of others superfluous; I mean the well-known account of faith which occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews."

It would be impossible for us, in a brief review like this, to give either any very large number of extracts, or to go at any length into the consideration of the various questions which the important subject which Dr. O'Brien treats of give rise to. We shall content ourselves, therefore, by laying before our readers one continuous passage, treating on certain difficulties attaching to his view of the matter. We cannot, however, omit giving his very admirable and energetic refutation and reproof of the false and sophistical statement—that we are not to attempt prayer till we are satisfied that we have a saving faith in Christ.

"Knowing that the Spirit works in and by means, he who preaches the truth in simplicity will employ appointed means, in humble reliance on the secret agency by which they are rendered effectual to the salvation of souls

will seek to abase the sinner's mind by the terrors of the law, and to raise it again by the mercies of the gospel. And to those whose solicitude about their soul is awakened, and who can find no rest—who feel strong convictions, but whose confidence is cold—to them he will not hesitate to say, *Persevere*. However imperfectly we can trace it, there is doubtless connected with the mysterious dispensations of God's grace, a constitution as regular as that by which His providence administers the affairs of the natural world; and they who, in the humble use of appointed means, are presenting their hearts to the influence of the source of spiritual life, may trust that that life will spring up within them, and go on to perfection; as he who casts his seed into the ground, relies on an influence no less unseen and uncontrollable to bring it to maturity. And, above all, remember that the bible directs us to *PRAYER*, as the prevailing instrument by which these transforming influences are to be brought down from on high; assuring us that our heavenly Father is ready to give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him. Ask, therefore, and it shall be given you.

“ ‘What!’ the class of religionists to whom I have alluded are ready to exclaim, upon every such exhortation as this, ‘desire a man to pray before he has faith?’ No, we do not desire a man to pray before he has faith. The apostle sufficiently guards us against such an error, if it were possible to fall into what is so like a contradiction in terms. He tells us that it is impossible to approach God acceptably without faith; but he at the same time tells us the kind and degree of faith necessary to warrant such an approach: and we should surely beware how we add to the conditions. ‘He that cometh to Him,’ saith he, ‘must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.’ Now, is not prayer to God (I do not mean a repetition of a form of words, but real prayer) the proper expression of this kind of faith, presupposing and requiring it? And is not a man, convinced upon the evidence of the Bible that faith in Christ is the gift of God, and that He is ready to bestow it upon all who ask it, in a condition to offer this prayer, which is of faith and for faith?

Doubtless he is. And of all the errors of this head-religion, and they are many, the interposing barriers between God and a soul, that, wrung with remorse, or softened by affliction, or shaken by terror, is about to cast itself upon God for light, and strength, and succour, seems the worst, the most presumptuous, and the most pernicious.

“ But prayer is too extensive a subject to be entered upon incidentally, and too important not to make me anxious to return to it. Meanwhile, I have no apprehensions, none at all, that I am misleading you, my brethren, when I say, If any of you be convinced by God's word that you are lost sinners, and that it is only by faith in Christ that you can be saved; and if you believe, on the same evidence, that faith is the gift of God, and that God is a hearer of prayer; thrust from you the frigid system, as shallow and false as it is cold, which would bar your access to the throne of grace, and stifle the cry of spiritual distress from rising to Him before whom it never rose in vain. In the self-abasement of conscious guilt—in the self-renunciation of conscious helplessness—with the fervour of heartfelt poverty, and

nakedness, and blindness, and misery, implore Him who giveth to all liberally and upbraideth not, that He would help your unbelief, and increase your faith, and it shall be unto you even as you will."

In reply to the objection, that supposing even faith in Christ to operate in the way of a restraining principle, it still goes far to destroy the connection between effort here and our destiny hereafter, he proceeds :

"Faith in the Redeemer, doubtless, as the objection supposes, teaches us to regard ourselves as pardoned by God, and restored to His favour—freely ; for the sake of a work in which we had not, nor could have had any share. It not only gives us no encouragement to do any thing to procure that pardon or to obtain that favour, but it denounces and stigmatizes all such attempts as derogating from the sufficiency of the Redeemer's work ; and for ourselves, and in our measure, *making void the cross of Christ*. This foundation of the objection is doubtless true ; but faith is no less solicitous to impress upon us that in thus uniting ourselves to the Lord, we are not terminating our course of discipline, but commencing it. That we become by faith *disciples of Christ* ; that we then but enter the school where we are formed for eternity ; by instructions and chastenings, by trials and blessings, by the outward dispensations of His providence, by the inward leadings of His Spirit, *to be made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light*. And surely, if the matter stood here, enough would seem supplied to secure anxious interest in the progress of this divine teaching, in the bare knowledge that it was going on. They who felt that they were in God's hands, and for such a purpose, could hardly be unconcerned about the progress that they were making, insensible to the pain of retrograding, to the pleasure of advancing in this heavenward course. The apostle certainly seems to find in this—in the bare consciousness that a power so wonderful is exercised upon us, and within us—motives the most persuasive to activity and assiduity, no less than to humility and awe. 'Work out your own salvation,' saith he, 'with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.'

"But in teaching us to regard life as a state of discipline—a state, that is, in which character is formed by conduct—revelation virtually establishes a connection between our conduct here and our destiny hereafter, which seems well fitted to exercise distinctly a concern for our own interests. We cannot look upon the diversities of moral character that surrounds us, whether among believers or unbelievers, without feeling sure that men pass through life very differently injured or improved by its teaching, and arrive at its close in very different moral states. If scriptural confirmation were needed for a truth so obvious to common observation, the Lord expressly tells us, that of those who do bring forth good fruit, some bring forth an hundred fold, some sixty, some thirty ; and that, on the other hand, a return to the thralldom of sin after a temporary escape from its yoke, can make the last state of a man worse than the first ; and that some are two-fold more children of hell than others.

"But if this difference exist at the close of life, it is surely impossible to

avoid believing that it continues after life is ended. Unless we suppose that God places us here for the formation of character; provides potent means to effect its formation; employs the events of life, the revelation of His will; the operation of His Spirit, to promote this design; bring all means, internal and external, natural and preternatural, to bear upon man to effect this end; and then, when life is over, interferes by an act of power to undo all that this elaborate system of forces had effected; unless, I say, we are prepared to adopt this unreasonable and wild supposition, we must believe that men enter the next, both the great divisions of it, as they leave this, in widely different degrees of moral advancement and of moral degradation. Now, this, fairly considered, is equivalent to asserting that they enjoy there very different degrees of happiness, and suffer there very different degrees of misery. For under every notion of the happiness of the future state, much of it must be supposed to consist in the exercise of those principles, in the indulgence of those affections, which it is the business of moral discipline here to invigorate and to purify. A more advanced state of moral improvement is, therefore, but another name for a higher capacity for this kind of happiness. and surely with Him, *in whose presence is fulness of joy, and at whose right hand there are pleasures for evermore*, the highest capacity for happiness must be the highest enjoyment of it. So that you see, that unless we suppose an express provision in heaven for excluding men from degrees of happiness, of which they have been by God's appointment rendered capable upon earth, we must suppose a wide distinction in the enjoyments of saints in the kingdom of glory; and if we only think how much of the misery of the realms of darkness must consist in the natural working of the evil principles which the discipline of life, when perverted from its true purpose, serves to foster and aggravate, we must see that there is the same necessity for inferring different degrees of suffering there.

" Thus, important differences in the condition of men hereafter would be the natural result of the differences of their moral state in leaving life; and this would be enough for my purpose: but we appear to have good authority for referring some differences in their future lot to what we would call a more direct appointment of God; as express authority as it would be reasonable to expect to have upon a subject on which the Scriptures always manifest remarkable reserve. The notions of the eternal world, usually entertained, are well expressed by an eloquent writer, when he calls it *an ocean of spirits without bottom and without shore*. But such vague notions of the world to come are not scriptural. The Bible, without supplying much food for curiosity, gives us more definite information concerning the state that awaits us. We know from the word of God that there exist now among the inhabitants of heaven wide distinctions. We are told of differences in angelic natures, which we must suppose real and important, but of which (though their existence is distinctly declared to us) we can form no very clear ideas. But, besides these, we read of distinctions among the angelic host, of which we can form better connections, distinctions of rank and authority, *thrones, and dominions, and principalities, and powers*. And the glimpses which we are given of the state of saints hereafter, seem to hold

out very clearly the existence and maintenance among them of the like distinctions. We have the apostles sitting upon thrones with Christ, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. We have the place of highest dignity on his right hand, and on his left hand, in his kingdom, reserved for those for whom his Father has destined it. We have the undefiled following the Lamb, whithersoever he goeth. While those whom he has brought out of great tribulation, serve him day and night in his temple. And other intimations will, probably, of themselves come to your minds, tending to establish the same fact—that though in the spiritual world, the righteous shall *ALL shine like the stars in the firmament for ever*, it shall be as in the natural world, where *one star differs from another star in glory*.

“But in addition to all such intimations of permanent distinctions in the condition of the blessed hereafter, it is to be remarked, that the plain aim of some parabolical representations of the final judgment, seems to be to convey to us, that in that righteous award, the precise station shall be assigned to each for which he has been fitted by the discipline of life. The servant whose pound had gained ten pounds, is set over ten cities; he who gained five, over five. And I may add, though it only bears upon my immediate purpose in showing how entirely the principle pervades God's government, that we are informed distinctly, that in awarding punishments in that hour, the same measure of severity shall be employed. That ignorance of God's will, for example, which, though it does not take away the guilt of sin, certainly lessens its heinousness, shall also mitigate its punishment; and while *the servant who knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; the servant who knew not his master's will, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes*. So that on the whole, besides those differences in the future happiness of moral agents, which we saw necessarily resulted from the difference of their moral state, it appears that we have good reasons to look for distinctions in their condition hereafter, depending also upon these moral differences: not, however, like the former, resulting naturally from them, but from a direct appointment grounded on them.”

The extracts which we have thus furnished, will serve to give our readers an idea of Dr. O'Brien's style, and of his mode of argumentation; we may safely add, also, a most favourable impression of both. With regard to his style, it is peculiarly happy, on account of what we may call its lucid brevity. There is no encumbering of the meaning, by the multiplicity of the words employed to convey it; and the words selected are ever the best. Foster, in one of his essays, remarking upon a certain vicious redundancy of style, in certain pulpit orators, observes, that if you throw away half the epithets they employ, no injury would still be done to what remained behind. The very opposite to this is what presents in reading Dr. O'Brien—you feel that you could not well spare a single term of all which he makes use of; while, at the same time, nothing is wanting toward the full conveyance of the author's meaning. It has been objected, we know, by some, that these Sermons are not suited for the gene-

reality of readers. But we would observe, in reply, that in the first place the pulpit of a University not only admits, but even demands a more severe style of reasoning, and more of learned reference and allusion than do others. The preachers in our colleges are, in a great measure, to be teachers of teachers. In the second place we would remark that it is far better for the minister to seek at bringing the minds of his hearers to a level somewhat above their own; and while every thing like obscurity should be avoided, there should be always a labouring at giving the habit to the hearer of reasoning soundly, as well as reflecting seriously. Were congregations better educated in this way, they would be in far less danger of taking up, as they so often do, with the crude absurdities imposed upon them by shallow schismatics, and pert pretenders to novelty. In this respect, then, we rejoice at the style of Dr. O'Brien's discourses, emanating, as they do, from a Professor of Divinity; we hope they may, and we have strong confidence that they will, tend to the giving a healthy and vigorous tone to the theology of our divinity students; and this we will maintain, that the man who is not able to *follow* the reasoning in the book before us, most assuredly is not fit to *lead* others in their enquiries after truth. Happy will it be for our land when our probationers for the ministry model themselves according to the sound and scriptural system of our first reformers, and, so far as man's teaching is concerned, make manuals of such books as "Magee on Atonement," and "O'Brien on Justification by Faith." We like to place the two in juxta-position, emanating, as they both have done, from our University. Trinity College may well be proud of both; let us add, she is so. She is pleased to see in O'Brien's Sermons a recurrence of the green and leafy honors which crowned her when Magee's work issued from the press:

"Miratur novae frondēs."

But we will not add "*et non sua poma*," for the fruit is fairly and honestly her own.

A certain dignitary of our Church has pronounced of Dr. O'Brien's book, that it is "extremely clever, but dangerous." Clever books are always so. We think the Doctor's book very dangerous, we confess; that is, to the system of anti-scriptural sophistry, which it impugns. It has given a finishing stroke to whatever yet lingered of Bishop Bull's posthumous reputation, as an upholder of the doctrine of Justification by Works; and certainly we think that the living author of certain Beaumont lectures must find O'Brien's work rather *dangerous* too. Be this as it may, however, we hope and pray that the admonitions contained in the concluding portion of those discourses will not be lost on those for whom they were intended:

"Many of those who hear me now, design themselves for the ministry of this Gospel: to whom therefore it will belong, not only to obey their

Master's commands, and to recommend his doctrine by their outward walk, but faithfully to teach it to the souls committed to their charge. To teach it faithfully, you must learn it faithfully; you must seek it in the word which is its only pure depository, and seek it there in humility, in sincerity, in patience, and in prayer.

"It is in such an inquiry as this that I have desired to engage you. I have endeavoured to present to you the fundamental doctrine of the Gospel of Christ, in scriptural simplicity; to expose some of the misrepresentations of it, on which you will have to decide for others and for yourselves; to show that they are distinctly denounced in God's word, and in the sound formularies of faith, which our church has derived from that word. And if I deceive myself in imagining that I have succeeded in attaining these objects, I am at least sure that I have presented the subject in a form which must clearly establish the duty of patiently investigating it. If I have not done so much as I desired, to aid or to abridge such investigations, I shall think that I have done what is still more important, if I have effectually promoted them.

"And to those whom such inquiries shall, under God's blessing, conduct to a knowledge of his truth—to these I would earnestly recommend, as above all other ministerial duties, the simple and faithful publication of it. I do not mean to dissuade from corruptions of the truth, which spring from party feelings or personal considerations; for I will not suppose any whom I address, at once so daring and so degraded, as to pollute his high calling by subserviency to such unworthy views. I speak only of those reserves and qualifications, which, whatever be their source, rest professedly upon some calculation of human wisdom, concerning the moral effects of gospel truth when simply and distinctly preached. I have, I think, shown that such apprehensions are groundless; that they really spring from loose views of the nature of the doctrine, from false views of human nature, or from the prejudice, pride, and corruption of our hearts. But the duty of faithfulness in preaching the Gospel, rests upon higher grounds than our ability to show, or to see, that such apprehensions are unfounded. It is a message from God which you undertake to deliver, and even they whose gods were no gods felt that the bearer of a divine message should not dare to alter it. It is a remedy prepared by the wisdom of God for the deadly diseases of our fallen nature, which you voluntarily engage to administer. Is not the folly of the empiricism that prompts you to adulterate it, lost in its awful presumption?

"Combat strenuously Antinomian abuses of the Gospel of Christ, if you shall encounter such in your ministry. Combat no less strenuously Pharisaical cavils against it, which you undoubtedly will encounter. Above all, struggle with, mourn over, pray against the Antinomianism and the Pharisaism which you will find cleaving to your own slow hearts;—but let no man take your crown. Let neither abuses, nor cavils, nor scoffs, nor calumnies, nor the vain reasonings of your own minds, nor the sad experience of your own hearts, seduce or drive you to the presumptuous and

perilous faithlessness, of qualifying God's message of mercy, or adulterating his remedy.

"Trials are the lot of human life: and to the course that you have chosen for yourselves, peculiar trials are assigned: trials in which you will be made to feel that God's servants must *cease from man*, and rest upon their Master alone for comfort and for strength; and assuredly you must feel that you can enjoy this cheering sense of his guidance and support, only so long as you are preaching, not your own cunning devices, but his simple truth.—In death, when you recal the manifold imperfections of your stewardship, you will need all consolation; do not voluntarily rob yourselves of the sure consolation that, however weakly you have discharged your important trust, you have in this discharged it honestly.—The trials of life and the pains of death, whatever they be, shall soon pass away: but there is an awful hour of trial to follow, for which life and death are both designed to prepare. In that awful hour you shall stand at the judgment-seat of Christ, and render there an account—not of your own souls only—but of the souls of the flock *over the which the Holy Ghost shall make you overseers*. As you would render that account *with joy and not with grief*; as you would stand before that throne *pure from the blood of all men*, do not *shun to declare unto them ALL THE COUNSEL OF GOD*."

It is really refreshing to the Christian ear to hear a trumpet tone like this echo along the cloisters of our University. May many soldiers of the Cross enlist themselves, while under its spirit-stirring appeals—embrace in all its fulness the great doctrine of Faith, not bating a particle of its genuine scriptural simplicity, yet showing both "by their preaching and living" that the faith which justifies is the faith which sanctifies also—or, to express the matter in the words of the great Pascal, "*LA FOI PARFAITE C'EST DIEU SENSIBLE AU CŒUR*."

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

(Concluded from page 239.)

“There is another feature in the German universities, which has often struck the literary men of other countries with surprise, and for which no satisfactory reason has usually been assigned. This is, the general character for diligence and unre-mitted study, which belongs to the students of Germany as a body. In all the universities, it is true, there are those who seem to regard it as the chief object of a residence there, to set at defiance all authority and all law, to escape as much as possible from the thralldom of all discipline, and to make it the great end of all their exertions to counteract, so far as they may be able, the purpose for which they were sent thither by their friends, and lay a broad foundation, not of future usefulness, but of future depravity. Such characters, however, are not confined to the universities of Germany; nor do they even there, as has been already remarked, constitute the greatest, nor even a great proportion of the whole number of students. To the great body must certainly be assigned the praise of diligent and patient study. Many of these, no doubt, are actuated by the love of study in itself; their thirst for knowledge spurs them on, and they make acquisitions which render them objects of admiration to their companions and to the learned world. But men like these are comparatively few; and they are chiefly those who afterwards devote their lives to the pursuits of literature and science, as professors in the universities, or in other similar stations; and even among these, among the thousand teachers of Germany, how few, comparatively, can be regarded as eminently distinguished. In proportion to the number of students, it may be safely averred, that fewer rise to distinguished eminence in Germany than in our own country. But, on the other hand, the great body of students are there carried forward far beyond our ordinary standard, and study with a perseverance that is with us rare.

“‘What then is the cause of all this diligence?’ is a question often asked. Is it because the German youth have more solidity, more seriousness of character, than our own? This assuredly is not the case; the chief secret lies here, as before, in the direct power of the governments over all places of honour and profit; in the general requisition of an university education as a *sine qua non* preparation for every public station; and lastly, and principally, in the fact, that no one is even then admitted into any profession, nor to hold any office whatever, without being first subjected to two, and sometimes three, severe examinations. Here is the strong hold of the governments upon the students, and the main secret of the good behaviour and diligence of the latter.

"If we look now for a moment at the actual state and character of the German universities, we shall find, along with all their vast and acknowledged advantages, several great and prominent evils, some of which have crept gradually in practice, and are susceptible of correction; while others are inherent in the system itself. Of the former kind, is the want of personal intercourse between the professors and students. As a general fact, most of the professors have no intercourse whatever with their pupils, except in the lecture rooms. They take no interest in them any further than to induce them, if possible, to attend their own lectures, and thus obtain the fee; but do not take the trouble to inquire whether a young man properly improves his time, nor whether he has chosen the best course of study, or the best means to help him forward in his progress. Any parental interest in a young man, or watch over his moral development, is a thing, generally speaking, entirely unknown. Individual professors do, indeed, occasionally invite a few of their own particular pupils to their houses, but rather as a matter of ceremony, than out of any regard to their moral or intellectual culture. This evil has doubtless arisen, partly in consequence of the laborious and secluded lives of the professors, and partly from the great number of the students, which renders it impossible to be upon an intimate footing with all. Still the evil might easily be corrected, could the professors become imbued with the proper spirit. A few, like Strauss and Neander at Berlin, and especially Tholuck at Halle, have begun a different course; and in the latter instance, particularly, the results have been highly beneficial.

"Another evil of the same class is, undoubtedly, the present character and conduct of a portion of the students. Left to themselves, without any direct moral or civil restraints, and without inspection on the part of their instructors, it is no wonder that young men should choose an errant course; but it must be borne in mind, that the character which is now attached to the life of a German student, is the inheritance of other days, and was acquired when the indirect restraints were far less than they now are. Until within the last few years the requisitions of the governments were much less strict than at present; and a mere residence at a university was assumed as a sufficient qualification for office, without further, or with slight examination. Under such circumstances, of course, those who entered the universities without any love of study, and merely to while away the requisite number of years, plunged at once into all the temptations and snares to which every assemblage of youth are exposed; and the whole burden of reproaches which the student of the present day must bear, the feats of drinking, smoking, duelling, &c., may be referred back to those earlier periods. But this evil belongs not to the system, any more than it is inherent in our own schools of law and medicine, where the students are in like manner left wholly to themselves. It is

in fact, diminishing; and in the universities of Berlin and Munich, situated in large cities, duelling and the other peculiar characteristics of a university life, are comparatively unknown; and the students have become, in a great measure, assimilated to the ordinary forms of social life.

"On the other hand, we may also remark two evils, which seem to result from the system itself, and which cannot be corrected without a change in the whole form of education. The first arises from the plan of oral lectures, as at present conducted, where the student writes down the words of the professor. Now where such lectures are treated, as is often the case, simply as a clue, to guide the learner's own reading and investigation, there is no plan of study more interesting or profitable; none which excites to greater ardour, or prompts to more persevering effort. But the mass of young men engaged in study are not of this class; they receive what is given them, and rest satisfied with believing it all on the authority of the professor. It cannot be denied, that the tendency of such a state of things is to fill the mind with superficial knowledge, without exciting it to the cultivation of its own energies; and it would not, perhaps, be too much to say that while the real scholars of Germany are in advance of any thing that we can boast, the great mass of her clergy and civilians, while they know accurately that which they have learned, are less trained to habits of independent thought, and the application of their knowledge to practical purposes, than the corresponding classes in our own land.

"Another and more serious evil arises from the exclusive devotion to particular studies, which constitutes one prominent trait of the German plan of education. Indeed, the system of a division of labour is here carried to as high a point, in regard to intellectual employment, as it is in England in respect to manual occupations. One theological professor devotes himself exclusively to the literature of the Old Testament; another to that of the New; a third, to systematic theology; a fourth, to the history of the church; a fifth, to practical theology. The same holds true in all other departments; and the consequence is, that while they become radically acquainted with all that relates to their particular branch of study, they cultivate less thoroughly the other departments connected with it; and leave entirely untouched many kinds of knowledge, which belong still more to the practical and ordinary course of human life. The result of all this is a want of general practical information, which is a marked characteristic of the educated men of Germany. They will overwhelm you with stores of argument and illustration on all topics of religion, morals, philosophy, and classical or oriental philology; but if asked a question relative to the ordinary affairs of life, or in general history, or in geography, they are often compelled to be silent. It may probably be truly said of the character of the German mind, that, as a

nation, they delight more than any other in abstraction, in pushing their reasonings to the utmost limits, regardless of consequences; and hence, have speculated oftener and wider beyond the limits of the human faculties, than any other people. Nothing is more true than that, in the words of their own Jean Paul, they 'hold the empire of the air,' and have had more strange conceits and fancies than any other nation. The general causes of this state of things seem to have been, in part at least, the condition of society, and the system of education among them, by which so many are trained up remote from the active duties of life, and thus lose all relish for practical objects. Of the 15,000 pupils at the universities, the greater part can never have the opportunity of becoming practical men; while they yet are taught to *think*, and their intellectual powers are urged to a high state of cultivation. In this way they are compelled to build their speculations, without any foundation of experience and practical common sense. What wonder, then, that these speculations should often prove baseless; the mere dreams of busy intellect, without the guidance of practical wisdom."

PART II., COURSE OF STUDY AT THE UNIVERSITIES.

"We have seen in the former part of this article, that teachers in the universities, and all those who engage in the practice of the various professions in Germany, are directly or indirectly dependent on the governments of the respective states, not only for actual employment, but also even for the previous license or permission to enter upon any profession or course of life. So far as it regards our present subject, all those who desire to become teachers of theology in the universities, or pastors of churches, have to submit themselves to various examinations required by the government, before they can make any application for employment in either of these capacities. Those who are preparing to become preachers, have also to pay attention to the subject *Pädagogik*, or the science of school-keeping; inasmuch as every pastor is *ex officio* required to inspect and superintend the school or schools within his jurisdiction. To enable the reader the better to understand the several steps and gradations of this ministerial preparation in Germany, it will be proper here to exhibit a brief outline of the constitution of the German churches, and thus show the manner in which the civil power directs and controls all the internal as well as external regulations, and all the movements of the ecclesiastical community. In doing this, we shall chiefly advert to the present system of the Prussian government, as the most extensive and complete; premising only, that the description will apply *mutatis mutandis* to all the other states of Protestant Germany.

"In Prussia (as also in France) the whole subject of ecclesiastical affairs, public instruction, and the profession of medicine,

is assigned to a particular department of the government, called the *Ministerium der geistlichen, Unterrichts-und Medicinal-Angelegenheiten*, the head of which takes rank with the other ministers of the crown. This ministry, or rather department of the ministry, has the direct and entire charge of all ecclesiastical matter; controls the consistories in the several provinces, and appoints all the members of them; and, either immediately or through the consistories and other subordinate branches of the government, appoints or confirms to all vacant ecclesiastical places or parishes. It has also the entire charge and control of all the universities, gymnasia, and other seminaries of learning of every species; appoints all the professors and instructors of every kind; and if it does not itself appoint the village schoolmasters, it fixes, at least, the necessary qualifications, without which no one can be permitted to become a candidate even for that humble office. The minister, of course, represents the king, and acts only in the king's name; and it is therefore through him, and his department, that all rewards are bestowed in these several branches of the body politic, whether consisting in an increase of salary, or in promotion, or what is more frequently the case, in the bestowment of some title or appellation of honour, a strong love for which is a predominating characteristic among all classes of the German community.

"For the purposes of its civil administration, Prussia is divided into ten provinces. These again are subdivided into districts, varying in number according to the size of the provinces. In each province there is a government, having in some respects jurisdiction over the whole province. In each district there is also a government, in some respects subordinate to that of the province; but in most instances, standing in direct communication with the several departments of the royal ministry in Berlin. In each province there is also a *consistory*, which has charge of all ecclesiastical affairs throughout the province. It is intimately connected with the provincial civil government; the president of the latter being always president of the former. To the consistories belong exclusively the examination of candidates for the ministerial office, except that sometimes, in order to alleviate the burden which comes upon them from this source, a commission is established at a university, before which the first examination may be held. The consistory has also in many, if not most instances, the disposal of vacant livings within its jurisdiction. The location of the consistory is usually in the capital of the province. In the several districts, a clerical member of the consistory is attached to the local government; and this is then charged with the various questions of local ecclesiastical policy, which occur within its bounds: or, at least, it has concurrent jurisdiction; and it would seem that questions relating to practical points are referred at will, either to the government of the district, or to the consistory of the province. In case of doubt, however, the district government does not refer the sub-

ject either to the consistory, or to the government of the province, but goes directly to the ministry of the king.

“Between these consistories and governments, and the pastors of the churches, there is still another intervening class or office, viz. that of Superintendent. To the office of pastor in a particular church, is associated the duty of *superintending* the neighbouring pastors and churches, and the schools contained within a certain district. These districts are usually small, and the number of churches, various. In one sense these Superintendents are therefore *bishops*, in as much as they have an oversight over the churches; but then this oversight seems intended only to enable them to make report to the higher powers; for they have themselves no power of introducing improvements nor of correcting abuses. In Saxony, indeed, they can examine and license the teachers of common schools; but this is not the case in Prussia. They have nothing to do with the *confirmation* either of adults or children, except in their own church; for this is every where the office of the pastor. They seem indeed, in Prussia at least, to be merely the organs of communication between the government and the lower clergy. The government seems never to communicate directly with a pastor; although the opposite is not true. A pastor may apply directly to the government of his district, or to the consistory; but the answer always comes to him through his Superintendent. The extent to which the power of the lower clergy is limited, will hardly be credited in this country; but it is illustrated by the following circumstance. In 1829 there was in Halle a great musical festival; in which the most distinguished singers and musical performers of northern Germany took part, to the number of more than five hundred. It was desirable to obtain for their accommodation the use of the largest church in Halle; but this could not be granted either by the vestry of the church itself, nor by the superintendent, nor by the magistracy of the city, nor indeed by any authority less than that of the district government at Merseberg. The use of the church on such an occasion, for the performance of secular music, was indeed a great departure from the ordinary practice in regard to churches, and impugned so much upon the prejudices of the people, that a complaint was afterwards lodged with the ministry in Berlin against the government at Merseberg, for having thus abandoned the church to an unholy use. This complaint was made by orthodox and conscientious men, although the feeling which prompted it was common to many others along with them; but coming at that particular juncture, when it could not fail to be mixed up with the difficulties which were already in embryo at Halle, it cannot appear to our American feelings in any other light than as highly injudicious.

“In some of the states there is also the title of General Superintendent, or one who has the general oversight throughout a province. His duties, however, are chiefly nominal; or they

consist at most in visiting occasionally the jurisdictions of the other Superintendents. Thus in the Grand-Duchy of Saxe-Weimar, there is a General Superintendent at Weimar, (formerly Herder, now Röhr,) and another at Eisenach, who are also the heads of the consistories in those places. In Prussia the title does not exist, except in the instance of a single person, who was appointed to that station a year or two since, with a jurisdiction over several of the Superintendents in the vicinity of Berlin. As a substitute for these officers, it would seem, and in consequence of his known preference for the English episcopal system, the King of Prussia has, within a few years, nominally appointed three bishops; but he has assigned them no general episcopal duties, and no episcopal jurisdiction. They seem to be merely a species of General Superintendents, with a more dignified title.

"This then is the general system of arrangements in Prussia. The king's ministry retains the charge of all the universities in its own hands; it appoints all the professors and instructors, and prescribes the requisitions which shall be made on all those who will enter upon the sacred office, or become theological teachers. It appoints also the consistories, and commits to them the charge of examining the candidates, and often of nominating them to vacant places. To aid them in their duties it also establishes in the universities, when necessary, standing commissions for holding the first theological examinations. These are the several bodies to which a young man has to look, in order to enter the ministry, after he has completed his university course. The cases of doubt and difficulty which arise in the practice of the ministerial profession may be referred, either to the consistory of the province, or to the government of the district.

"Similar also are the regulations of Prussia in regard to those who will become teachers in the gymnasia, or other public schools. In every province there exists, along with the consistory, a *school commission*, whose duty it is to examine in like manner those who are candidates for places as teachers. For this object also there are similar commissions in the several universities. All these are under the same department of the general government or ministry; and bear the same relation to it in this branch of education, as the consistories and theological examiners do in the division of ecclesiastical affairs.

"So it is in Prussia. In the other German states there is not always a special department of the ministry devoted to this object; but the affairs of the church are sometimes managed by an upper consistory, as in Saxony; or sometimes by two, as in Weimar; and these stand in direct communication with the sovereign and his privy council. In the kingdom of Hanover there are no less than six consistories, which would appear to possess the highest power in ecclesiastical matters, after the king in council. But the system of Superintendents goes through the whole land; and the lower clergy in general, as well as the course of theological

education, are every where on the same footing as in the Prussian states.

"We have already seen in the former part of this article that students of every kind, before coming to the university, must gone have through a course of preparatory study, usually at a gymnasium. It may not be useless, perhaps, nor uninteresting, to add here a few remarks supplementary to what was there said on this subject.

"In all the gymnasia there are two semi-annual examinations, for those who are about to leave those institutions and enter the universities. These occur at Easter and Michaelmas, in April and September, at the time when the semesters of the universities are usually brought to a close. These examinations cover the whole ground of study during the course pursued at the gymnasia, and embrace the Latin and Greek languages, history and geography, both ancient and modern, and the mathematics. They consist not only in oral questions and replies, but tasks are assigned in each of these branches, which the scholar is required to work out in writing, in a solitary chamber into which *he is locked up*. In order to judge of his proficiency in Latin, extracts from Horace, Cicero, Livy, Tacitus, or Virgil, are laid before him, upon which he is required to give a regular interpretation and commentary; and he is also obliged to make out a written exercise in Latin, while under lock and key. The same takes place likewise in regard to the Greek, in which, besides the task of the closet, passages from the Iliad or Odyssey, or from the tragedies of Sophocles, or from other writers, are assigned him for interpretation. In all the branches of history and geography, the process is the same, viz. oral examination, and exercises written on the spot without the aid of books. In mathematics, equations and problems, as far as spherical trigonometry, are given, which must in like manner be solved without aid. Besides these subjects, on which all are examined alike, those who intend to pursue at the university the study of theology are examined in Hebrew; for which purpose, passages from Genesis and the Psalms are laid before them to be regularly interpreted.

"This system of *closet labour*, or the imposing of exercises to be performed in solitude and without the aid of books, though not a peculiar feature of German discipline, is yet a favourite one, and is carried through all their examinations, even those appointed by the state. To perform well an exercise of this sort presupposes, no doubt, if not a much wider range of study, yet at least a much more thorough acquaintance with the subjects of study than is for the most part to be found in our country. The known necessity of sustaining such an examination, together with the consequences which flow from it, must also unquestionably exert a powerful influence on the mind of the scholar, and render him studious not only to lay up in his mind the outlines of knowledge, but also to fill up these outlines as he goes along; not only to ascertain the various sources from which he

may draw, but actually to derive from them and treasure up that information for which he looks to them, not only to fill up the store-house of his mind, but also to have his stores always at command, and become a *ready*, as well as a learned man. Indeed it may be said that the German system of examination aims to exclude partiality and personal favour, and to ascertain the real amount and value of the acquisitions which every scholar has made.

"Those who have thus sustained an examination at the gymnasium receive a certificate of their progress and standing, which, according to their degree of merit, is the testimonial No. 1, or No. 2. There are also instances of those who receive No. 3. These are such as are adjudged, after trial, not yet to be fully qualified to enter upon a university course. With this testimonial, however, they are permitted to go to the university, but are excluded from all participation in the foundations for the assistance of indigent students: and are moreover required, at every future examination, to exhibit evidence that they have made up for all previous deficiencies. It follows of course, that No. 3 can be no very desirable species of testimonial, inasmuch as it subjects a student to inconvenience and to an inferiority of standing throughout his whole university course; and the motives are therefore very powerful which serve to impel a scholar to rise to a good standing, if not to eminence, in his preparatory studies.

"Furnished with these credentials, the former scholars of the gymnasium repair to the universities of their respective states, and on presenting their testimonials, are admitted as students of the university, after receiving matriculation. All those who enter at the commencement of each semester are usually matriculated at once, soon after the opening of the lectures. The ceremony consists merely in meeting the Prorector, who usually makes a short address, and reads to them the form of matriculation, by which they promise to obey the laws and honour the instructors. To this they give their assent, and confirm it by the *Handsclag*, or shaking hands with the Prorector, which constitutes a species of oath. Those who have not gone through a course of preparation at a gymnasium, or who have left the gymnasium without undergoing an examination, are obliged to present themselves before a commission appointed for that purpose by the government in each university, and there sustain a trial similar to that above described. Students from the other states of Germany, or from foreign countries, are not required to be examined at all, unless it be their purpose to remain in the state where the university is situated, and enter its service.

This provision in respect to foreign students is certainly a very liberal one. It admits them to make use of all the privileges of the universities, without laying upon them any restraint whatever. They are subject to no examination on entering upon their course, and to none on leaving it, and are entirely free as to their

choice of lectures and instructors. It is this which renders a German university so desirable a resort for an American student; because it presents to him all the advantages which a nation of the most systematic scholars on earth can afford, without requiring of him any thing in return, either in the shape of antecedent preparation or subsequent examination. If, indeed, he wishes to take his degree, he must of course receive it in the regular way of examination and disputation; unless, as has been the case with most of our countrymen, it be bestowed as a matter of favour. This, however, is but a name; while the substance may be obtained without restriction.

It might, perhaps, at first view, be supposed that this system of entire freedom in regard to the students of other states, would enable young men to evade the strict regulations of the different governments in regard to examinations, and obtain a university education and subsequent employment in different states, without subjecting themselves to the usual rigorous trials. It might seem, perhaps, that a native of Saxony, for instance, could pursue his studies at the university of Göttingen, in the kingdom of Hanover, and afterwards enter the service of Prussia. This, however, is by no means the case. He could indeed enter the university of Göttingen and reside there as long as he pleased, without examination, provided he disclaimed any intention of remaining in Hanover as a professional man; but he could not afterwards establish himself in any profession in Prussia, without first undergoing there all the examinations regularly required by the Prussian government, or producing evidence that he had already sustained equivalent ones in another state. He could not even go back to his native Saxony, and enter upon a professional course; because Saxony, like all the other states, requires that for this purpose, he shall have spent two years at the university of his native state. So that instead of any evasion, instead of deriving any advantage from thus studying at a foreign university, he suffers a positive disadvantage. Of course, cases of this kind never occur. Indeed the different governments have their own systems so nicely arranged, and there is such a perfect understanding among them all in regard to the universities, that any erratic course of education is impossible.

We might also suppose that the practice of receiving scholars into the universities, simply on the testimonials which they bring with them from the gymnasia, would lead to great irregularity and confusion; that the students would come in every stage of preparation; and would therefore be, in a great measure, incapable of proceeding together in a common path of discipline and study. Indeed, as applied to our own country, such a system would be fraught with insurmountable evils. Did our colleges, for example, receive students from the various academies, on the simple testimonials of their former instructors, the door would be open for irregularities of every sort; and that for the plain reason that in our academies there is no uniform system running

through the whole, not even through all those of a single state. But in Germany the case is directly the contrary; the governments of the respective states have established a uniform system throughout all their own gymnasia; the course of studies in all is the same, or is every where equivalent; the mode of examination in all is the same; and of course the testimonials from the different gymnasia of any state have all an equal value. As there is in each university a commission or board, established by the government, to examine those for admission who have been prepared by a private course and not at a gymnasium, so the officers of each gymnasium constitute a similar board, appointed in the same manner, to examine for admission to the university those who have been prepared under their care. Moreover, the parallel in our country would probably lie, not with our colleges, but with our professional seminaries. These might even now, without much danger, admit young men from the different colleges without further examination, on their merely exhibiting evidence of having honourably completed the regular college course. The course and system of instruction in all these institutions of ours, are in most respects so very similar, that an examination by the officers of a college might, so far as intellectual acquirements are concerned, be safely adopted as the ground of admission to a professional seminary; or at least to those which make in this respect no greater requisitions than are implied in a college examination.

The remarks thus far made are applicable to all the students who enter the universities, without respect to their future distribution among the various faculties. The only point of difference in regard to future theological students is that they have also to sustain an examination in the Hebrew language. If now we look for a moment at the subjects, or the extent of the ground, on which the previous examinations are thus held, they might seem to a casual observer to be very limited, and to imply nothing of that depth and thoroughness which are usually assigned as the characteristics of the German schools. It should, however, be remembered that this thoroughness depends much more on the mode of instruction and study, than on the quantity gone over; and that, after a certain point, the greater the amount nominally acquired, the less radical and real will be the progress of the pupil. The examinations above referred to, although apparently less extensive and various than those of most of our colleges, are to be viewed in connexion with the fact, that they are mostly held in Latin, in which also the exercises of the higher classes of the gymnasia are usually performed; that the required interpretation of a Latin or Greek author implies a regular commentary, including both the lower and higher criticism, to be given upon the spot without previous study; that written exercises, both in Latin and Greek, are also to be given in, the former of which is to serve as a specimen of their Latin style; and that these are to be made on subjects given out at the moment, and

written without the aid of books, while locked up in a solitary apartment. It is circumstances like these that serve to test the radical and accurate scholarship of the pupil; far more indeed than to have gone over twice the quantity of ground in the same period of time.

Turn we now more particularly and exclusively to the students of theology, already matriculated, and thus become regular members of the university. They have now chosen their future career; they are entering upon a course of professional study, which is to give a character and colouring to their whole future lives; for the instances are in Germany exceedingly rare where a young man passes from the study of one of the professions to that of another. The chief reason of this is the long and laborious preparation required to enter upon any professional career; and the fact, that in changing one's profession, all preparatory study is in a great measure rendered useless, while he has to begin *de novo* a course of three years' labour. But in thus entering upon a course of theological professional study, in order to become the teachers of the Christian religion, there is this obvious and striking deficiency running through the whole system of the German universities and churches, that the students are never questioned in regard to their *motives* in thus devoting themselves to the sacred office, nor in any shape examined as to their personal piety, nor in respect to their belief in a revelation, or even in the existence of a God. It is enough that they have been baptized and confirmed, and that they are free from the imputation of crime or open immorality. That they drink to excess, or gamble, or fight duels, or *renown* in every shape, is never brought up against them, unless such things have become the subject of open and scandalous notoriety. That extreme cases like these are rare, is matter of gratitude; that they can exist at all, or that the great body of theological students may be, and often are, men destitute of any personal religion, and of any regard to the sacred profession which they have assumed, further than as it affords a means of reputation and honourable subsistence, is greatly to be deplored. This state of things, however, is not peculiar to Germany. Indeed, it is almost a necessary consequence of the so called union of church and state; an union which in Protestant countries has ever consisted in the entire subserviency of the church to the state, and in its dependence upon worldly-minded rulers for its support, and by consequence for its internal arrangement and constitution. While professing to establish religion and the church of Christ on a sure and permanent basis, the civil power has always taken care to assume the direction and control over the church; and to make that to be the true religion, and that to be the constitution of the church, which should best comport with its own views of expediency, and with its own safety and permanency. This is an obvious and necessary conclusion from the history of every Protestant state, which has undertaken to support the church by the arm of civil

power. That the Romish church forms any exception to this remark, arises from the fact that it has itself a head who claims pre-eminence and sovereignty above all other sovereigns; and even in countries where this claim is not acknowledged, as heretofore in France, the church has yet formed a body separate from the body politic, and, by its wealth and influence and power, has contrived, when not resisted and overthrown by the interposition of the people, to render the government subservient to its designs. The princes of this world, alas! and its less princely rulers too, are most frequently men without religion themselves, and therefore have respect to it only in reference to its general influence on the welfare of their states, or the security of their own power. Woe to the church that is subject to such a head—that must receive its constitution and its ordinances and its ministers by the appointment of such an authority! The churches of Germany are mostly in this predicament, and teachers of religion are trained up for them, of whom it is not even asked, whether they believe in that religion which they profess to teach. The Church of England is in this predicament, modified only by the limited authority of the English monarch; and how many of her clergy are men of a mere worldly spirit and even dissipated character! Let, then, American Christians rejoice that the churches are here thrown back upon their primitive foundation, the hearts and affections of the followers of Christ; that they neither receive nor claim support from the civil power, any further than it becomes the government of every Christian country to provide against open violations of public order and religion. So much as this is demanded of every government bearing the name of Christian; not by any church, nor in support of any particular church, but in order that it may correspond with the very elements of Christian society.

In regard to the studies pursued by theological students at the universities, they not only have the privilege of attending lectures on such other branches as they may choose, but are also expected and required to continue their attention to, and make further progress in, the studies of the philosophical department or faculty of letters. Every student of theology, therefore, is also inscribed in this faculty; and in addition to his theological studies, is required to attend lectures on logic, metaphysics, ethics or moral philosophy, and the philosophy of religion; by which last is understood the philosophical exhibition of the eternal and universal ideas which lie at the foundation of every particular religion, and the examination of the religious tendencies and propensities of our nature. In addition to these, it is not unusual for the students of theology to pursue classical philology and literature to a very considerable extent; or to attend lectures on history, or on one or more of the natural sciences. Indeed the means are furnished, and young men are invited to extend their researches into the whole field of ancient and modern literature, and to wander at will throughout the wide kingdoms of science and nature.

AN ESSAY ON WHITE LIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—It is a just cause of wonder to every reflecting mind, that after all that has been done by means both ordinary and miraculous to effect the promulgation, to prove the truth, and to perpetuate the preaching of the glorious Gospel, it should still be perversely and rationally misunderstood by thousands of those that call themselves Christians. That its evidences should be impugned, its professors ridiculed and persecuted, and its humbling and rigorous doctrines and precepts proudly rejected, is no matter of astonishment, when we consider the desperate wickedness of the human heart; but that those who own its Divine authority, and who believe that they are to be judged and have their eternal doom assigned them according to that Gospel, should be labouring all their lives long, notwithstanding the testimonies of their own conscience and experience, the plain declarations of the Bible, and the earnest teachings of its ministers, in ignorance, either wilful or involuntary, of what that Gospel really and principally makes known to them, and demands of them, is truly amazing, and more than any finite faculties could have foreseen. Not only are the sublime doctrines of the Gospel continually misapprehended by numbers who call themselves Christians, but its plain and practical precepts too. How inadequate are the notions which thousands have, at this day, of the extent and rigour of the Christian precepts of forgiveness, of humility, of watchfulness, of prayer, and, above all, of nonconformity to the world, and active, laborious benevolence! And still more imperfect are the views that many even pious people have of the necessity of wisdom and purity in words. Is it not the case, that in our examinations of ourselves, and our judgments of each other—in the public teachings of our clergy, and in the writings of Christian moralists, there is far too little account taken of the tongue, that “unruly evil, full of deadly poison?” It is to be feared that in the attention and anxiety displayed about actions and feelings, there is a sad negligence among Christians, true, devoted Christians, about words. There is room for most perilous mistake here.

To my mind this is a very awful consideration—that the principal part of the probation of many people may be in regard to words. A man may be placed by circumstances, such as his rank, his occupation, his condition as to income, his health and natural temperament, and the extent and character of the society in which he spends his life, out of the way of much trial and temptation with regard to action: while he may have brought hourly in his way, occasions of standing or falling, of glorifying or dishonouring God, by words—the issues of which occasions, though little weighed by men, may be put down, moment after

moment, in the book of God's remembrance, and form a record of omission and commission; of obedience and transgression, of acceptance and condemnation, as grave and dreadful as the records which that book contains concerning the crimes or shining holiness of many whose lives are before the eyes and in the tongues of all men. Thus many of us may be awfully mistaken in our ideas of the advances we have made in the divine life, and of the soundness and extent of the work of grace within us, from a want of attention to this important test of character. At the peril of our souls will it be, if we think too lightly of those sayings which occur in God's dread Word on this head. "I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment; for by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." Matt. xii. 36, 37. "If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body. The tongue is a little member, and boasteth great things. Behold how great a wood a little fire kindleth! And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity; so is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature, and it is set on fire of hell. For every kind of beasts, and of birds, and of serpents, and of things in the sea, is tamed, and hath been tamed of mankind; but the tongue can no man tame; it is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison." James, iii. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8.

It is not my intention to enter at large upon the discussion of what may be wanting in the notions and practice of pious Christians in this respect, although it seems to be a matter deserving of more extended remark; but I have a few words to say on a point on which there is very little or no difference or error of opinion among the readers of the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER; I mean the moral turpitude of what are called *white lies*. It would be a sort of impertinence to set about proving to the majority of your readers that all violations of truth are sinful. They take the command in its widest sense: "Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another." Lev. xix. 11. They believe that "As a madman who scattereth firebrands, arrows and death, so is the man who deceiveth his neighbour, and saith, am I not in sport?" Prov. xxvi. 18, 19. They know that into the New Jerusalem "shall in no wise enter any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie." Rev. xxi. 27. But it is an undeniable and a surprising fact, that great numbers who would feel greatly wronged if you were to doubt their being good Christians, fancy that there is no criminality in lies on certain occasions. I was lately in a company where it was maintained by two gentlemen, the one a Protestant and the other a Roman Catholic, that a man commits not the slightest sin when, for instance, he tells you a capital story about the sport he has had in catching a dish of trout, when he has caught none of them, but only bought them from a more fortunate fisherman;

or when, by a well-timed lie, he saves two friends from quarrelling, or stops the inquiries of an impertinent curiosity, or helps himself or his friend out of a troublesome position with respect to some trifling matter; in short, when he utters any lies that do no harm to any body, and break no engagement, but rather save trouble and vexation, and promotes good humour and peace.

The way in which I tried to convince them of their error was this: I read, from the 5th chapter of Acts, this little history: "A certain man, named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife, sold a possession, and kept back part of the price, his wife being also privy to it, and brought a certain part, and laid it at the apostles' feet. But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God. And Ananias, hearing these words, fell down and gave up the ghost; and great fear came upon all them that heard these things," and so forth, to the eleventh verse.

"Now consider," said I, "the crime and the punishment of this unhappy pair. Ananias sold a possession, and set aside a part, most likely the greatest part, of the proceeds for a gift of generous charity, to which he was bound by no authority on earth, nor by the most rigorous commands of his religion. No man had a right to know how much he sold it for, or to prescribe to him how much he should give away of the price to the poor. He laid aside a part for his own rightful use, and brought the rest a free-will donation to those who had no claim upon him. We do not read that he made any parade, or used any boastful air or language; he showed no false accounts; he said not a syllable of falsehood or prevarication; he wronged no man breathing; he broke no pledge, nor was there the remotest chance of misunderstanding or scandal, either public or private, arising from his conduct; and yet he was struck dead on the spot by a bolt from heaven! For what crime? Because he went there with his mind made up to tell a *white lie*! A little lie was in his heart, upon a matter which no man had a right to question him about—a little boasting lie that would wrong or hurt nobody, which was intended to deny no fault, nor conceal any thing he needed to be ashamed of; but which would tend to secure to him the good opinion of the good, and make a generous action look still more generous. It is hard to conceive a guile so innocent or justifiable as this, or to find a sin whose whiteness is so hard to distinguish from the spotless and snowy candour of truth. No human sagacity, but that Spirit alone who searcheth all things, could have detected and exposed it.

Now I cannot persuade myself that this awful judgment was inflicted on Ananias and his guilty partner merely on account of those two persons; but I apprehend that this was done so suddenly and publicly, and recorded so particularly, more for our

warning than for their punishment. It seems as though it were the purpose of the Holy Ghost once for all to give a demonstration of his abhorrence of all deceit and equivocation, at this beginning of the Gospel dispensation, and to show to all the generations to come, how high a pitch of holiness the religion of Jesus Christ inculcated both in thought and word, as well as deed. It seems, too, that the intention here is not only to teach us that God abhors all seemingly harmless falsehood, but to enable us also to conceive the measure of that abhorrence, and of the punishment which awaits the crime. We may depend upon it there was no injustice done to the victims, and that the wrath thus heavily dealt upon them was not a whit the more severe because they were to be made an example of to us. The manner of the punishment was peculiar to their case, but not so the certainty and the weight of God's displeasure against the sin; and it would be equally dishonourable to Eternal Justice to suppose Him capriciously moved to unusual severity, or to suppose that He deliberately added a pang to the inflicted vengeance, for the sake of a general warning to others. Whether the anger of God followed them beyond the grave, and excluded them for ever from his presence, we know not; but however that may be, we see that all the loss, all the disgrace, and all the penalty, that man can endure in this state of being, were discharged upon them. We behold them consigned to a sudden, an ignominious, and a terrible death; we see them, without a warning, a blessing, or a comfort, in the full vigour of health, struck with the convulsions of dissolution, being doomed to signal shame before the assembled church, and all those agonies which death inflicts when fiercely and victoriously he wrestles with the unimpaired strength of life through every limb and muscle—agonies that we cannot suppose a frame worn down by sickness could ever feel. And it is a horrible, and yet a reasonable conclusion for the impenitent sinner to draw, that this terrifying tragedy, with all the everlasting sequel it may have, is the expression for the unit of that suffering that shall be heaped, and heaped, and heaped upon his head in repeated bitterness for every repeated transgression, as the wages of what? Of what he calls his innocence! Then tell us, O ye echoes of the infernal caverns!—tell us, O ye fallen seraphim, preserved in chains of darkness unto judgment!—tell us, O ye primeval morning stars that mark the mighty cycles of eternity!—what, O what shall be that hell of anguish and despair that his undying spirit must endure for what he calls his crimes?

These were the arguments I tried to bring forward and enforce from the Word of God; and before the majesty of that Word every one present bowed; and my opponents solemnly expressed their conviction that they had been dangerously in the wrong, together with their determination, in the fear and by the help of God, to think and act otherwise in future.

The Protestant advocate for white lies was, altogether without excuse, as he had been a thousand times taught better things for the Romanist some apology may be received, for there is

nothing in the practice or the precepts of his church to guard him against so destructive a mistake.

In the "*Key of Paradise*," a prayer-book printed in Dublin, by authority, *permissu superiorum*, and much used by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, there is a catalogue of the seven mortal sins—which are pride, covetousness, lechery, anger, gluttony, envy, sloth. Lying is not included in the catalogue. There is also in the same book a form of self-examination on these mortal sins, in which the heads of this miserable division are expanded into particulars; but neither in this more precise enumeration is any thing said about lies, except that, under the head of Pride, the penitent is told to examine himself, "whether, if he be held a person of value, he hath boasted of any good or evil that he hath done, whether truly or falsely, with injury to God or his neighbour;" and also "whether he has stubbornly impugned the truth, or, because he would not submit or seem to be convinced, obstinately defended a manifest error against his conscience." Thus it appears that a man needs not reckon among his mortal sins any lies he may have told, if he has only refrained from boasting falsely, with injury to God or his neighbour (of which injury he must of course be judge himself,) of any good or evil he hath done, and from stubbornly impugning the known truth. All the rest are only venial sins, which he may get rid of without any trouble of self-examination, contrition, or confession, by indulgences and jubilees, that may be had for a few shillings, and the mumbling of a few prayers. There is a very curious indulgence offered to the faithful in this "*Key of Paradise*," which I can notice without wandering from my subject, as it is a very pretty example of a white lie. In the Office of the Conception of the B. V. M. there are an anthem and a prayer, both in honour of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, which are introduced by this rubric: "*The anthem following, with the prayer of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin, was approved by Pope Paul the Fifth, who hath granted a hundred days of indulgence to all faithful Christians that devoutly repeat the same!*" Do not be incredulous, gentle reader; the book is to be had to-day in every Romanist bookseller's shop in Dublin, and you may convince yourself in a moment of the shameful dishonesty and priestcraft of the superior Romish clergy of Dublin. They themselves all know and believe the doctrine of the immaculate conception to be a false and a blasphemous doctrine; but yet, acting on their favourite principle of securing their influence over their wretched flocks, by feeding and encouraging their darkest superstitions, they promise them a hundred days exemption from the punishment of all venial sins, either here or in purgatory, as they pretend to explain the grant; or an exemption from all the guilt of venial sins committed during a hundred days, as thousands of the people explain it—some reckoning the days past, backward from the present, and some of them forward for the future,—if they will approach God and the Virgin with what their teachers

know to be an impious falsehood—declaring, in their worship to both, that she was conceived, and was born, and died, without any taint of original or of actual sin! But observe the way in which this is introduced; it does not form part of the Office of the Conception, but is appended to it. The *immaculate conception* is no doctrine of the Roman Church, but it is believed by many of the people, and zealously maintained by many of the mendicant friars, among whom it is still and has always been a cause of wrangling and hatred, and a disputed point on which they have written, and preached, and wrought miracles, and anathematized, and burned each other alive, with a thousand times more acrimony and clamour than ever any two sects of Protestants have discharged against each other. It is not a doctrine of the church—it is directly opposed to the doctrine of the church—but it is a gainful doctrine, as useful as any infallible tenet of them all, for keeping the people hood-winked; and it is therefore put forth here, not as a declared doctrine of the church, but without any hint that the church does not receive it, and under the sanction of Pope Paul the Fifth; thus bearing on the face of it a lie, but a venial one only, being intended to be received by the people as an infallible truth, but not actually and formally pronounced as such.

In the same "Key of Paradise," there is an Examen of Conscience, for the use of the faithful, on the ten commandments; meant as a preparation for confession. The queries extend over six pages. Let us see what the penitent is taught to question himself about on the third and ninth commandments, or, as the Romanists call them, the second and eighth. These two, and particularly the third, are pronounced against all deceit in words. Some people seem to think that it is in the ninth commandment we are to look for the prohibition of lying in general, and that the third is intended principally to condemn all blasphemous and irreverent mention of the name and attributes of God; but this is a slight mistake, which a proper attention to the best expositors would remove. In Hebrew, the same word means a vain thing and a lie; and in this place the word should be translated a lie or falsehood. *לא תשא אמת שוא* is rendered by Gesenius thus: "*Du sollst den Namen Jehovah's nicht zu einer Lüge aussprechen.*" Thou shalt not utter the name of Jehovah to a lie. This is equivalent to a prohibition of all lying whatever, since it was the custom to call God to witness, or to say "as the Lord liveth," or some such expression, in making any important or solemn affirmation, not only in courts of justice, but in ordinary conversation. Moreover, as this precept, like the rest, is exceeding broad, and as the seventh commandment condemns all impurity, and the eighth all dishonesty, so this forbids all false speaking, whether the name of God be named or not. But, in truth, there cannot be an affirmation made without an appeal to God, and the mention of his name expressed or implied. Hence all good moralists maintain that, in speaking,

every man is under two checks or engagements; by the very act of speaking he calls the ever-present God to witness, and binds himself by an obligation to his neighbour to tell him the truth. A lie, then, whether a white one or a black one, is a breach of faith to man, and a contempt and insult to the listening and observing Majesty of Heaven; in a word, it is a crime that strikes at the root of all religion and all human society.

To return to the "Key of Paradise." What questions is the Roman Catholic taught to ask himself about these two precepts? Under the third, there are two queries supplied, which are all about taking of oaths and making solemn vows, but not a word is said about lies not actually sworn to, either white or black ones. Under the ninth, there are nine queries, in which no mention is made of any falsehoods that are not actual bearing of false witness against another, except in one, which teaches the reader to ask himself whether he has spoken any untruth *with notable prejudice to his neighbour!* Thus no lie whatever, except it be sworn on oath, or deliberately uttered in giving false witness, comes within the scope of these two comprehensive commandments, unless the liar conceives it to have been spoken with notable prejudice to his neighbour, of which he himself is the only judge!

In truth, it would be unreasonable to expect from the present members of the unchangeable church of Rome, any higher morality than what the holy Fathers, by whom they swear in all they find corrupt in them, while they deny and refuse the greater part of what they find good in them, had attained to. It is a strange and a lamentable fact, that no part of practical Christianity became sooner defiled than purity and honesty in words. Even in the second and third centuries, the heathen maxims and practice, in the matter of useful lies and pious frauds, were received and defended; and nearly every one of the Fathers, for some ages, and particularly in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, was sore smitten with this infallible infirmity.

The heathen poets and philosophers maintained the propriety of certain lies in very plain terms. The poet Æschylus, who was of the school of Pythagoras, thus sings:—

"Λωπυτης δίκαιος ουκ αποσταται Θεος,
Ψευδῶν δὲ καίτοι ἐστὶ τιμὴ Θεός."

Deceit, when just, God judges not a crime,
But honours lying at a proper time.

Timæus Locrus, a Pythagorean philosopher, said to have been the master of Plato, observes, "ὥς γὰρ τὰ σώματα νοσηδεῖσι ποκα ὑγιαζομεν, εἰκα μὴ εἰκῇ τοις ὑγεινοτάτοις, οὕτω τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπειρῶμεν ψευδεσι λόγοις, εἰκα μὴ ἀγεται ἀληθεσί."—*Libro de anima mundi*, p. 566. "For as we sometimes heal bodies by unhealthy remedies, when they will not yield to what is healthy, so we restrain men's minds by false words, when they will not be

guided by true ones." The same doctrine is taught by Plato in his works, and particularly in the third book of his Republic, where he has these words: "Τοις ἀρχουσι δὴ τῆς πόλεως εἰ παρὰ ἄλλοις τισὶν προσήκειν ψευδεσθαι ἢ πολεμίων ἢ πολιτῶν ἐνεκα ἐπ' οφελείαν τῆς πόλεως. Τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις πᾶσιν ἐκ ἀπτεον τε τοιῆται." "The rulers of the state have an undoubted right to tell lies in their dealings either with foes or friends, for the good of the state; but none besides ought to meddle with these things."

An everlasting proof of the extent to which this infection had in early times run, is the book entitled the "Recognitions of Clement." It must have been written in the beginning of the third century, for a great part of it is employed in refuting the heresy of Simon Magus, whose sect was nearly extinct at the end of that century, as we learn from Origen Contra Celsum; and it was exceedingly popular throughout the East, as might be expected from the philosophy and wit which abound in it, and which prove that the author was one of the most learned men of his age. In it we find St. Peter relating to Clement, the pretended author of the book, that he had a number of disciples as spies in the train of Simon Magus, under the pretence of being his followers. When Peter came to Berytus, he was assailed with abusive language by Simon, and accused by him of magic. Peter did not deny the charge, but "καταπληκτικῇ τῇ παρηρησίᾳ εἶπεν, 'πρὸς δὲ τοῦτοις ἐτοιμὸς εἰμι, εἰ μὴ πειθῇ μοι περὶ ὧν λέγω, τὴν πᾶσαν ὑμῶν ἐκβαθρῆναι πόλιν.'"—Homil. vii. s. 10. "He said, with surprising promptness and boldness, 'Besides this, I am prepared, if you do not comply with all that I say, to plunge the whole of your city into destruction.'" We read, moreover, that Simon Magus, to serve his wicked ends, changed, by his magic, the features of Clement's father to his own. Peter, however, very cleverly turns this cheat to his own advantage; for he sends Clement to Antioch, and tells him publicly to retract all the calumnies that Simon had uttered against him, which he did in the counterfeited person of Simon, in consequence of which the people received Peter the next time he went there with the warmest welcome.

Origen, in his preface to his book against Celsus, after quoting the words of St. Paul, Col. ii. 8, in which he speaks of philosophy as vain deceit, thus remarks: "Κακεῖνα μὲν ἐχόνμα τι ἀπατηλὸν κενὴν ἀπάτην ὠνομάσαε, ταχὺ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν ἀπάτης οὐ κενῆς, ἣν θεωρήσας ὁ Ἱερειμίας ἐτολμήσαε πρὸς Θεὸν εἰπεῖν τὸ ἠπατήσας με Κύριε καὶ ἠπατήσθην." "These things, in which there was a certain deception, he named *vain deceit*, perhaps in contradistinction to deceit that is not vain, such as Jeremiah had in his thoughts when he dared to say unto God, 'Thou hast deceived me, O Lord, and I am deceived.'" Origen then divided deceit into *κενὴν* and *οὐ κενὴν*—vain and not vain. Ruffinus was guilty of repeated forgeries, both in what he wrote and what he translated from Origen—tricks that he had learned from his master Didymus. Jerome quotes, from the 6th of Origen's Stromata,

the words of Plato, which I have cited above, together with a long note on them, which thus concludes: "Ex quo perspicuum est, quod nisi ita mentiti fuerimus, ut magnum nobis et hoc aliquid quærat bonum, judicandi simus, quasi inimici ejus qui ait, Ego sum veritas." "Hence it appears that if we do not so lie as that some great good may accrue to us from it, we are to be judged the enemies of him who said, I am the truth." Jerome speaks of him in terms of condemnation; but, in his *Apologia pro libris adv. Jovianum*, he contends that all that was great among the philosophers and rhetoricians, and all that was holy and reverend among the Christians, had used these artifices, at least against enemies; and no wonder that Jerome thought so, when Didymus was his master too.

A curious instance of a defence of deceit is found in Chrysostom's first book, *De Sacerdotio*. Basilus, his dearest friend, and he, were fellow-monks. It was reported that they were both to be made bishops. This Chrysostom determined to avoid for himself, but yet wished not to rob the church of so good a pastor as his friend would be, who, however, was resolved to do only as Chrysostom should do. He told Basilus, therefore, not to trouble himself about the matter at present, but to rest persuaded that they should not be separated: "*Και υπερ εμαυτη παρεσχον θαρρειν ων ομογνωμησαντες ει ποτι συμβαινει τοιoutον τι παθειν.*" "I assured him that he had no need to fear about me, for that I would go along with him, if any thing of the kind should befall us"—that is, the being made bishops. When the time came for their being ordained, Chrysostom hid himself, and the other went and received ordination, expecting Chrysostom to come after him presently. "*Αυτας μηδεν τουτων ειδως αgetαι μεν ως εφ' ετερη προφασει, δεχεται δε τον ζυγον, ελπιζων εf' ων υποσχημενοι ην αυτω και ημας παντας εψεσθαι μαλλον δε νομιζων ημιν ακολουθειν.*" "He, knowing nothing of all this, was led away on some other pretext, and received the yoke, expecting, from what I had promised him, that we also would all follow, or rather fancying that we had gone before;" for some of those that were present, seeing him reluctant, upbraided him with being disobedient, when Chrysostom had already complied with the will of the Fathers. When all was over, he went to Chrysostom, and with tears and lamentations complained of the trick played upon him by a friend he so dearly loved. At this the saint bursts into a fit of laughter, and begins by a long train of arguments to defend himself. He shows that in war nothing was so creditable and judicious as well-managed deceit; and that it was a most necessary thing in peace also, not only in affairs of government, but even in private affairs, among the members of the same household. "*Και γαρ των τε Σαυλ χειρων η τε Σαυλ θυγατηρ εκ ισχυσεεν αν ετερων εξελεσθαι τον ανδρα τον αυτης αλλ' η μετα του παρ' αλογισσασθαι τον πατερα' ο ταυτης δε αδελφον τον υμ' εκεινης διασωθησα, σωσαι βουλευμενος κινδυνευοντα παλιν τοις αυτοις οπλοις εχρησατο οιν περ η γυνη.*" "For neither could the daughter of Saul have saved her husband

from Saul's hand, if she had not cheated her father; and when her brother wished to rescue him whom she had preserved, when he was again exposed to peril, he made use of the same arms that she had employed." He next brings an argument from the practice of physicians, telling a queer story about one who saved his patient's life by chousing him. Then he thus goes on: "ὡς τὰς πολλὰς μυριάδας ἐκεῖνας ὁ μακάριος προσηγαγετα Πάυλος. Μετὰ ταύτας τῆς προαίρεσεως περιετίμε τον Τιμοθεον ὁ Γαλαταὶ ἀπειλῶν ὅτι Χριστος ἔδεν ὠφελήσει τοῖς περιτμνομένοις. Δια τοῦτο ὑπο νομον ἐγίνετο ὁ ζῆμιαν ἡγεμενος μετὰ τὴν εἰς Χριστον πίστιν τὴν ἀπο τοῦ νομο δικαιοσύνην. πολλὰ γὰρ ἡ τῆς ἀπατῆς ἰσχύς μονον μὴ μετὰ δολέρας προαγέσθω τῆς προαίρεσεως. μάλλον δὲ ἔδε ἀπατὴν το τοῦτο δὲ καλεῖν ἀλλ' οἰκονομίαν τινα καὶ σοφίαν καὶ τεχνὴν ἱκανὴν πολλοὺς πορῆς ἐν τοῖς ἀποροῖς εὖρειν, καὶ πλημμελίαις ἐπανορθῶσαι ψυχῆς. ἔδε γὰρ τον Φίνεας ἀνδροφονον εἰποιμ' ἀν ἐγώγε καὶ τοι γε μίᾳ πληγῇ δυο σώματα ἀνέειλεν. ὥστερ ἔδε τον Ἡλιαν μετὰ τὰς ἑκατον ζυγαῖας, καὶ τοὺς τέτων ἡγεμόνας, καὶ τον πολὺν των αἱμάτων χειμαρρὸν ὃν ἐκ τῆς των ἱερμενῶν τοῖς δαίμοσιν ἐποίησε ρεῦσαι σφαγῆς. εἰ γὰρ τὸτο σὺγχωρησάμεν, καὶ τὴν πράγματα τῆς των πέποιηκότων τῆς προαίρεσεως γυμνῶσαι ἐξετάζοι καθ' ἑαυτά, καὶ τον Ἀβραάμ παιδοκτονίας ὁ βελομενος κρίνει, καὶ τον ἐκγονον τον ἐκεῖνον καὶ ἀπογονον κακουργίας καὶ δολῆ γραφεται. οὕτω γὰρ ὁ μὴν τῆς φύσεως ἐκρατήσε πρεσβειῶν, ὃ δὲ τον των Αἰγυπτίων πλουτον εἰς τον των Ἰσραηλιτῶν μετένεγκε σῖτρατον. Ἀλλ' ἔκ ἐστὶ ταῦτα, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀπατὴ τῆς τολμῆς. ἢ γὰρ μονον αὐτοὺς αἰτίας ἀφιεμέν ἀλλὰ καὶ θαυμάζομεν δια ταῦτα, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς αὐτοὺς δια πάντα ἐκήνεσε. καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἀπατεῶν ἐκεῖνος ἀν εἰ καλεῖσθαι δίκαιος, ὁ τῷ πραγματὶ κεχρημένος ἀδικῶς, ἐκ' ὁ μεθ' ὧντος γινώμεν τὸτο ποιῶν. καὶ πολλὰκις ἀπατῆσαι δεόν, καὶ τὰ μέγιστα δια ταύτης ὠφελῆσαι τῆς τεχνῆς· ὁ δὲ ἐξ ευθείας προσε- νεχθεὶς κακὰ μέγιστα τον ἐκ ἀπατῆθεατα ἐργάσατο." "In this way the blessed Paul gained those many myriads of converts. He circumcised Timothy with this intent; although he had threatened the Galatians that if they were circumcised, Christ would profit them nothing. For this reason he became under the law, although he conceived the righteousness that was by the law to be loss and harm after the faith in Christ. For there is great efficacy in deceit, so it be not carried on with a fraudulent purpose. Indeed such measures ought not be called deceit at all, but a prudent and wise kind of management, and a skill well adapted for finding numerous resources in difficulties; and for correcting the errors and disorders of the soul. Assuredly I would not call Phineas a murderer, although he slew two persons with one blow; nor Elias either, notwithstanding his destroying the hundred soldiers and their captains, and the great torrents of blood that he caused to flow by the slaughter of those who were sacrificing to demons. For if we give up this point, and begin to examine the bare facts themselves, stripped of their intention, any man may convict Abraham of the murder of his son, and his descendants of fraud and villainy—so strangely did the one con-

quer all the promptings of nature, and the other transferred the wealth of the Egyptians into the camp of the Israelites. But it is not so—it never can be so—away with such an audacious charge! We do not only acquit them of the accusation, but we admire them on account of these things, since God himself also has applauded them throughout. It is the man who wrongfully meddles with such matters that is to be justly held a cheat—not he who acts in this manner with a sound intention. And it frequently behoves us to employ deceit, and by this skill to secure the greatest advantages; insomuch that he who arrives at his point in the straight-forward way, often does the greatest injury to the man whom he has failed to deceive.”

No wonder that the Romish priesthood exalt the holy Fathers above God's word, when they furnish them with theories so useful as these! They have even improved upon their models. They have the doctrine of the venial nature of officious lies, as they are called, stated in their most accurate writers in terms that almost render it impossible for an ordinary liar to convict himself of mortal sin, that is, of an actual breach of the commandment of God; for venial sins are not held to be contrary to the end of the commandment, being, as they say, not inconsistent with charity. (See Dr. Doyle's Christian Doctrine, p. 46.)

In Escobar. *Moralis Theolog.* Tract 1, Ex. 10, c. 2, a book which is, if I am not greatly mistaken, a class-book at Maynooth, we read: “Num veritatem aliquando celare licet? Licet equidem. Interrogatos an habeas pecuniam, si cum injuriâ petatur, negare poles, *aut si adsit rationabilis causa id faciendi*. Perniciosum igitur mendacium grave aut leve est juxta materiem; jocosum et officiosum veniale plerumque.” “May a man sometimes conceal the truth? Undoubtedly he may. If you are asked whether you have any money, and there is an appearance of violence, you may say you have none, *or if you have any reasonable cause for saying so*. Hurtful lies are serious or trifling according to circumstances; jocular and officious lies are for the most part venial.”

There are two horrible principles in the morals of Popery, that exceed in wickedness and impudence all that the fiercest pride and misanthropy of the ancient Jews, cruel and unyielding as they were, and all that the most degraded flagitiousness of Paganism, were ever guilty of; I mean the maxim, that all faith may be lawfully broken with a heretic, even to the destruction of his very life; and the power they arrogate to themselves, of dispensing with the most solemn oaths and vows, and of cutting away all the obligations whereby a man can pledge and bind himself to his God on the one hand, or to assembled thousands of his fellow-creatures on the other. In the Bull whereby Innocent III. excommunicated Count Ramon of Thoulouse, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance, the maxim that faith is not to be kept with heretics is stated as perfectly canonical. “Juxta Sanctorum Patrum canonicas Scripturas ei qui fidem Deo non

servat fides servanda non sit." (Catel. Hist. des Comtes de Toulouse p. 242.) "According to the canonical writings of the holy Fathers, faith is not to be kept with him who keeps not his faith with God." Among the decrees of the Council of Constance, this stands recorded as the word of the Holy Ghost, spoken by the collective infallibility of the Church of Rome: "This synod declares that all safe-conducts granted by the emperor, by kings, and other secular princes, to heretics, or to persons accused of heresy, in the hope of reclaiming them, ought not to be of any prejudice to the Catholic faith or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, nor prevent these persons from being examined, judged, and punished as justice may require, if those heretics refuse to retract their errors, even though they came to the place where they are to be judged, relying solely upon the faith of that safe conduct, and would not have gone thither without it."

There is another piece of history too that Protestants ought not to forget; for we may rest assured that the infallible hierarchy have not forgotten it, but know the precedent well, and admire it; which is this: It was part of the coronation oath of Arragon, that the king should not expel the Moriscoes upon any pretence whatever; that he should not force them to be baptized, nor accept a dispensation for that purpose; and that if he did accept a dispensation for that purpose, all that he did thereby should be null and void. This oath was taken by Charles V., and Pope Clement VII. absolved him from it!! Thus an oath never to accept a dispensation was dispensed!

These are the maxims of the Holy Roman Catholic Church! and however our fellow-countrymen of that church may sincerely abhor them, their priests know well that they are bound to put them in practice whenever the interests of their order shall make it necessary and safe; and to these maxims the creed of Pope Pius IV. binds the consciences of every Romanist, whether priest or layman.

It was my intention, Mr. Editor, when I began this article, to make some observations on the notions of the ancient Jews about lies and deceit in words, both in their transactions with each other and with Gentiles; but I have already trespassed too far upon your pages and your readers' patience. Those who are not already acquainted with the book, will find some learned and interesting information on the subject in Selden, *De Jure Naturali et Gentium secundam Disciplinam Ebræorum*, lib. vi. cap. iii.

T. P. K.

ON THE LITURGY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—In the event of a revision of the “Book of Common Prayer,” the enclosed alterations would, I think, be worthy of consideration. Your giving them a place in the EXAMINER will be esteemed a favour; and if they be accompanied by some observations, examining them freely, and approving, condemning, altering, or amending them, the obligation will be increased. Some of them may have been suggested by others; some I do not recollect having seen or heard of before. Altogether, they have the merit, I conceive, of not interfering with essentials, and of being in accordance with what “hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her public Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it.”

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

W. F. M.

The present Sunday Morning Service to be divided into two parts, to be celebrated at two distinct hours, with an interval of * hours between each.

The first service to commence at* o'clock, and to consist of “Morning Prayer,” including the singing of a Psalm, † in the place directed for “the Anthem,” and the Litany.

The second service to be “the Communion;” including the singing of a Psalm at the commencement, and after the Nicene Creed, and a sermon in the usual place.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be administered on every Sunday in the year, Good Friday, and Christmas Day.

The office of Parish Clerk to be abolished; and the whole congregation to join in the responses.

The Lessons at “Morning Prayer,” on the 1st of January ‡ to remain as at present; but a Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, appropriate to the first day of a new year, to be substituted for those used at present.

* These blanks to be filled up as may be found convenient. In most country places, eight o'clock, A.M. in summer, and nine A.M. in winter, would be suitable hours for the first service.

† The officiating minister to give out the Psalm, in which as many of the congregation as possible should join.

‡ On this day (except when it shall fall on a Sunday) and on other days when there shall be no administration of the Lord's Supper, the second service to end with the apostolic benediction after the sermon.

Proper Lessons to be appointed for Ash Wednesday. At "Morning Prayer" on this day, after the 'prayer in the Litany, "We humbly beseech thee," part of the Communion Service to be read, beginning from the Psalm "Have mercy," to the end of the service; omitting from the two last verses of the Psalm down to the end of the Lord's Prayer.

The following sentence to be added to those with which Morning Prayer commences.

"The Lord is in his holy temple: let all the earth keep silence before him."—Hab. ii. 20. *

In the Rubric, after the general confession, the words "The declaration of God's pardon of sins," to be inserted, instead of "The absolution or remission of sins." The same change in the Communion Service. The form in this latter service to be used in the "Office for the Visitation of the Sick."

At the end of the Rubric, before "Venite Exultemus," the following words to be added, "On which day also the 'Gloria Patri' after it, is to be omitted."

In the Rubric, after the "Venite," the words "at the end of every Psalm throughout the year," to be changed to "At the end of every portion of the Psalms appointed for Morning and Evening prayer." (The Bible version of the Psalms to be used.)

In the Rubric, before the Apostles' Creed, the exception as to the creed of St. Athanasius to be left out.

The Rubric before the Athanasian Creed to be omitted, and the following, or one of similar purport, to be inserted. "On Trinity Sunday, at Morning Prayer, immediately after the Apostles' Creed is ended, the Minister shall say to the people, 'Brethren, formerly in the Churches it was the practice that, on certain days, the following confession of faith, commonly called the Athanasian Creed, should be used; which practice is now laid aside. Instead thereof it is thought good that on this day, dedicated especially to the honour of the Holy and Blessed Trinity, the same should be read; to the intent ye may be warned that the Church hath not, by the alteration of the custom, in any wise changed her faith in the matters to which that creed relates. You are therefore requested to sit down, and listen attentively while it is read to you: remembering always, that every doctrine contained in it can be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.' The people then sitting down, the minister alone shall distinctly read the Creed."

At the end of the last sentence, "this is the Catholic Faith," &c. &c., the following rubric to be inserted:

"Here all the people standing up shall say, 'Glory be to the Father, and to,' " &c. &c.

"Minister; As it was in the beginning," &c. &c.

* This sentence is in the American Liturgy.

The minister shall then go on with Morning Prayer, saying "The Lord be with you."

In the Apostles' Creed, the article "He descended into hell," to be altered or omitted.

In the third Collect at Evening Prayer, the word "spiritual" to be inserted before "darkness."

In the "Prayer for the Clergy and people," the words "worketh great marvels," to be left out, and the following, or others more appropriate, to be inserted: "Giveth the increase to whatever is planted in thy holy Church." Or the invocation to run thus: "O God the Holy Ghost,* who by thy mighty power giveth the increase," &c. &c.

In the Communion Service the words "Let us pray," to be placed before the Lord's Prayer at the commencement.

The second paragraph of the Rubric, after the Nicene Creed, to be placed before the last paragraph of the Rubric, after "the sentences," in the Offertory. The sentences relating to giving oblations to the minister, and the two sentences from Tobit, to be left out.

The prayer for the Church militant to be omitted in the place where it now stands, † so that after the minister has placed the bread and wine on the table, he shall go at once to the exhortation "Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the," &c. &c. ‡ The people sitting till the confession.

In the general confession the word "confess" to be substituted for "bewail," and instead of "We *do* earnestly," "*are* heartily," "the remembrance *is*," "the burden *is*," to say, "O make us earnestly," "be heartily," "make the remembrance of them grievous," "the burden of them intolerable."

In the prayer "O Lord and heavenly Father," in the Post Communion, the word "fulfilled to be changed to "full filled."

Public baptism to be at "Morning Prayer," in the face of the congregation. Private baptism to be strictly prohibited, except a certificate be given to the minister that the child is in danger of dying. The private service to be confined as much as possible to essentials.

In the burial service more arrangement to be made, to prevent the necessity of bringing the coffin into the Church, and yet the whole service to be used.

The churching of women to take place after the sermon, before the minister proceeds with the Communion, of which the woman is to partake.

* It is worthy of remark, that at present there is no prayer in our Liturgy, addressed especially to the Third Person of the Trinity, while there are two to the Second Person.

† If it be used at all in this service, the form being certainly very ancient, it might be very well substituted for the prayers for the King, after the Commandments.

‡ In this exhortation the word "damnation" to be changed for "judgment" or "condemnation."

PARALLEL BETWEEN THE MILLENARIANS AND ROMANISTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—Among the signs of the times, there are few things calculated to awaken so many melancholy feelings in the Christian spirit, as the strange and awful delusions into which some of our modern Millenarians have fallen. Too many among them have been led to admit and receive some of the very worst principles of the Church of Rome, and they have been drawn into them in the way of natural consequence, from certain principles of the Millennial system, from which they are legitimately deducible. This tendency to Popery, this lapsing into its most unscriptural errors, is a very awful fact, when we reflect that it is prevalent among some of the Clergy of the Established Church; and when we remember that several persons in England have been led thereby to fall openly into the apostacy of Rome, it is time for some effort on the parts of those in authority, to stem the tide of danger.

I write not this in allusion to all our weaker brethren who have been permitted to fall into the Millenarian hypothesis, but only in allusion to those who have passed the threshold, and entered, as it were, within the vail. There are many who are but "babes," in reference to it, and who, though just initiated into it, and catching, as they think, a few faint glimpses of its splendors, have proceeded no farther; they seem, like children, to have been captivated by the lovely and ideal beauties of the Millenium; they look kindly, and pleasedly, and complacently upon its bright and rainbow hues, and it is therefore natural, that with minds of a certain cast, such a vision should take the place of the reveries and day-dreams of our youth; but they proceed no farther; and as they take no pains to examine very deeply into a dream so full of charms, so they are not led into all the fearful and awful consequences that necessarily flow from it. There are others, however, who may be said to have raised the vail, and who seem to think that all the mysteries of the Millenium stand revealed before their eyes. These persons have grasped the doctrine of the Millenium as a truth, as the very chiefest of truths, and looking on it as the very centre of a divine system, as the sun round which all other lights and doctrines move in their various orbits, they have drunk deeply of the intoxicating subject, and followed out and traced all the consequences connected with it. I have personally known clergymen of the Established Church adopt principles flowing from this system, which seem to me scarcely removed one hair's-breadth from Popery—*Purgatory, Miracles, an Infallible Tribunal, Sacrifice of the Mass*—consequences which would thrill with horror the minds of the uninitiated, but which are easily received by the "perfect" Millenarian.

1. There are few points more prominently put forth by these persons, than that this earth is to be the theatre of the Christian eternal blessedness; they teach that it is to be renovated by the removal of the primeval curse, and purified by fire, so as to become the everlasting home of the blessed. A favorite argument in support of this view is derived from the supposal that the great Creator could not think of cursing the earth *for ever*; that he should not be supposed capable of marring the loveliness of his own fair creation, and letting his own handy-work remain under the curse, withering and blasted *for ever*. They thus gradually persuade themselves, that God could not thus wreak his wrath *for ever* upon this earth; and they then pass naturally on to the notion, that as man, immortal man, is the noblest and fairest of all his great creation, so he cannot be supposed willing to let the curse remain on man, any more than on the earth, *for ever*: they think that God hath sorely punished him for his transgression, but will yet, in some future day, remove the curse of sin and punishment from ALL the children of Adam, so that although some shall be lost, yet it shall only be for a time, and thus every soul, without exception, shall finally be saved.

They are led still farther into this wild delusion, by their singular interpretation of some passages of Scripture. This may be illustrated by an individual instance, such as Rom. viii. 21, which they apply to the Millennial ages, and in which they understand the words "every creature," and "the whole creation" in an universal sense, as embracing not merely "the new creature" of 2 Cor. v. 17, but every unholy as well as every holy creature, and the whole ungodly as well as the godly creation; so that they naturally, and indeed necessarily conclude that ALL, both holy and unholy, both godly and ungodly, have an earnest expectation and a hope, and shall, in the fulness of time "be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Such an application of this Scripture to the Millenium thus necessarily leads to the opinion that "every creature" universally shall finally be saved.

Now this odious and unscriptural heresy, which, I grieve to say, has been received by some of the Clergy of the Established Church, is scarcely, if at all, removed from that of the Romish PURGATORY; there is, at best, but a mere shadow between them; for when we make the torments of hell to be only temporary, instead of eternal, we are, to all intents and purposes, transubstantiating hell into a purgatory. Indeed, some of the arguments which they adduce from the mercy of God, and the frailty of man, and the supposed unwillingness of God to punish *for ever* the failings of a creature so frail and weak as man, are pretty much of a piece with those adduced in support of the temporal punishments of purgatory. This much, however, is plain, namely, that this doctrine admits the grand principle which forms the very soul of the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, for it assumes that by a certain continuance in torment, a man

becomes fitted for admission into heaven. Whether these torments are supposed to purify the soul, or to render satisfaction to God for sin, yet it is plain that, to all intents and purposes, it is the very same in principle, and that the man who adopts such a doctrine has plunged into at least one of the abominations of the Church of Rome.

2. The modern views of the Millenarians have also led to some very dangerous opinions respecting miracles—opinions as little removed from those of the Church of Rome as can well be conceived. Either for the purposes of encreasing the supposed glory and pre-eminence of the heirs of the Millennial splendours, or for the purpose of convincing all unbelieving gainsayers, the power of working miracles, and speaking in unknown tongues, is to be restored to the Church! Indeed, some of these mistaken individuals have actually fancied that these miraculous powers are to proceed, rather than to accompany, the Millennial glories, and have therefore begun to exercise the marvellous gifts already, in such a fashion as to disgrace the Church in the eyes of unbelievers, and to cause very grievous offence to the faithful and spiritual-minded people of God. Some of them have far eclipsed the absurdities of Hohenloe.

Nor could it well be otherwise; for when we examine those portions of the Old Testament, which these Millenarians adduce to prove the restoration of the Jews, and the establishment of their carnal Millenium, we shall find that there is even mixed up with them an intimation of a greater outpouring of the Holy Spirit than had previously been vouchsafed to the Church. This is particularly observable in those passages of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, which relate to the return of the Jews from the captivity in Babylon, or which point to the opening of the Christian dispensation, amidst the effusions of the Holy Spirit. Now, as the Millenarians apply, or rather misapply, these passages to a period yet future, they are naturally led to expect in that future period, a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit in miraculous manifestations similar, or rather greater than those which marked the opening of the Christian dispensation. I write this in reference to the texts in general, though perhaps an individual example would be better; I shall, therefore, refer to that remarkable prophecy of Joel, ii. 28, to which some of my brother Clergymen of the Established Church have often referred me, in proof of the power of working miracles being yet in the Church. Now although this prophecy of Joel, with all its promises of the Spirit and miraculous manifestations, is distinctly and positively stated by St. Peter to have been fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, as appears from Acts, ii. 16; yet these Millenarians, by applying it to their supposed Millenium, are led to expect all those miraculous manifestations at a future period: they accordingly say, that at this moment they are displaying themselves in the Church, and that at all events the Church has a right to the possession and exercise of such miraculous powers.

All this has followed naturally from their referring to a future period the fulfilment of those Scriptures of prophecy which pointed to the miraculous manifestations which marked the first founding of the Christian Church.

I shall not enter on any very critical disquisition on miracles, which I believe to have long since ceased in the Church, but I ask whether this is one iota removed from the doctrine of the Church of Rome?—The Millenarians argue that miracles were never formally withdrawn from the Church, and that we must thence suppose them to continue; so, also, do the Romanists argue. The Millenarians state that such a power ought to exist, in order to display the mind of the Spirit in the true Church, or body of believers—so, also, do the Romanists. Both parties argue in the same way, and almost from the very same texts, as will appear from the tractates published in defence of the miracles of Hohenloe. For my part, I believe, that as the occasion for miracles ceased, so the power of working them was withdrawn from the Church; I am, therefore, always disposed to ascribe the pretended miracles to which Romanists refer me, when they pompously talk of them as a note of their's being the true Church, either to a wild fanaticism on one hand, or to profligate knavery on the other. I confess I see no reason why I should not regard the Millenarians and their miracles in a similar light, for neither in their arguments nor in their practice in this matter can I discover any important difference. I cannot discover any reason why I should assent to one, without admitting the other; so that it appears to me, that notwithstanding all the opposition we made to the miracles of Hohenloe, some years since, we have laboured to little purpose, for we have seen the very same principle adopted among our Millenarian brethren of the Established Church.

3. It has become necessary to the system of the Millenium, at least in the eyes of those "perfect" Millenarians, of whom I write, that there should be made out, and clearly established, a necessity, or at least a very great fitness and suitableness in those extraordinary outpourings of the Holy Ghost. They are led to this by a species of moral constraint, a kind of argumentative compulsion, for their opponents often ask, as I have myself asked, of what use are all these pretended gifts of prophecy, and miracles, and unknown tongues, so claimed among them? *Cui bono?* They were valuable on the opening of the Christian dispensation, that all men might see that it was indeed the power of God, by the signs and wonders that accompanied the preaching of the Word, and that all men might argue in the common-sense fashion of Nicodemus, "We know thou art a teacher come from God, for no man could do the miracles that thou doest, except God were with him." The peculiar gift, too, of speaking in unknown tongues, was so evidently given with the intention of enabling them to fulfil our Lord's mission, "go teach all nations," which they could not accomplish unless enabled to speak

the tongues of *all* nations; but in the present state of the Church, and in a country where there is no diversity of language, there would be a sad and fearful waste of the gifts. I would, therefore, ask of all those who are tainted with this Irvingism, *Cui bono?*

This question has been answered by the Millenarians in precisely the same way as it has been often before answered by the Romanists, namely, by saying that it is necessary for the peace and purity, and authority of the Church, that there should be a miraculous manifestation, or a sensible interposition of the Holy Spirit, in order to put an end to all doubts and controversies among us, by an infallible display of the mind of that Holy Spirit. If, indeed, this be their design, they have proved very insufficient means to such an end; for instead of deciding and silencing all controversies, they have only given birth to new ones. Be that, however, as it may, it is certain that this principle leads to that grand foundation-stone of Popery, the supposed necessity of an *infallible tribunal*, to decide the controversies that agitate the Church.

I will illustrate this doctrine by alluding to a conversation which I lately held with a brother Christian and clergyman of the Established Church, who has been permitted to fall, I trust only for a time, into those awful errors. He stated his full conviction of the necessity of "a living and speaking infallible tribunal in the Church;" and when I replied, that we possessed in the Holy Scriptures an infallible voice, which, as the rule of faith, was to decide all things for the Christian, he rejoined that that was not sufficient, because the Holy Scriptures were silent words; that, as they could not speak, could never decide our controversies as to the import of the very passages themselves; and that it was therefore necessary, for the unity of the Church, that there should be something exterior to the Scriptures, which could authoritatively interpret them, and thus decide infallibly all our controversies. When I pressed on him that this was identically the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and that he was therein admitting the most important principle of that grand apostacy, he replied by reprobating the Church of Rome in strong language; but added, at the same time, that he believed that the Church of Rome had much clearer and more correct views, as to the nature and character of the true church, than were to be found generally in the Protestant Churches. Our long and interesting conversation concluded by his admitting that he claimed for the Church that "living and speaking infallible tribunal," to which the Church of Rome only pretended; and that the difference between him and her was merely as to the organ or instrument of that infallible voice—the Church of Rome maintaining that it was *the Holy Spirit speaking in her bishops assembled in council*; while he held that it was *the Holy Spirit speaking in certain gifted individuals in the congregation*. Such was the only difference; and surely when such doctrines are held by pious clergymen of the

Established Church, we may well tremble at such a near approach to the very worst and rankest abominations of Popery.

4. But, farther again than all this, it has been deemed necessary, to the adequate proof of the Millenium, to adduce a very large body of texts from the Old Testament, which refer to the restoration of the Jews to Palestine. These texts, as every accurate reader will perceive, relate to the return of the Jews from their dispersion and captivity in Babylon, and their restoration, together with all their rituals, to their own land, after their seventy years' captivity. These texts, however, are referred to their anticipated Millenium by our Millenarian friends; and they are thence led to expect certain otherwise unlooked for events, as already noted, in connection with that period. For instance, all those passages of the prophets, which, according to their interpretation, prove a yet future restoration of the Jews to their own land in the Millennial ages, do also prove something more than that; they prove also, at the same time, the restoration of the whole Mosaic economy, all the institutions respecting sacrifices, incense, ritual observances, and all the ordinances and ceremonies of the Mosaic law! This matter is so clearly deducible from the texts cited by the Millenarians, that they have been led, by their application of Ezekiel's temple, and other such Scriptures, to conclude that we are about to return to Judaism, and that the Millennial age is to be essentially a Jewish dispensation, in which the people of God are to worship him, not only "in spirit and in truth," but also with "the blood of bulls and of calves," and with all the sprinklings, and incense, and temple service of the ancient days!

They have thus been led to believe that we shall return to sacrifices—to *daily sacrifices*. They have been forced into this opinion as a necessary consequence of their application of certain passages in the New Testament also; as in that place, in Rev. v. 10, where it is said, "Thou hast made us kings and *priests* unto God, and we shall reign on the earth." Now as they insist on a literal interpretation of this, by which they are to be literally kings reigning on the earth during the Millenium, so they are constrained to interpret the word "*priests*," which in the original is *ιερεας*, in the same literal manner; thus leading them to the opinion that we shall be literally sacrificing priests, with our daily sacrifices, as in the days of the Jewish economy.

It may very reasonably be asked, as I have often asked our Millenarian brethren, what need have we of such sacrifices of bulls and of goats, or of any daily sacrifice, that we should return to them, when we have the one sacrifice, once offered, even Jesus Christ? This question may be followed by another, namely, is not such a doctrine of the necessity of such sacrifices an impeachment of the all-sufficiency of the sacrifice on the cross? These questions are just as applicable to the Millenarian doctrine of a *daily sacrifice of bulls and goats*, as to the Romish doctrine of a *daily sacrifice of the mass*; they are as pungent against one doctrine

as against the other; and it grieves me to be obliged to add that those important questions are answered by the Millenarians in the same, or almost the same manner and form of words, as by the Romanists; each of them asserting alike that their daily sacrifice is no impeachment of the suffering of the cross, and that it is to hold *retrospectively* the same position which those of the Jews held *prospectively* of Christ. I have often argued against this Millenarian doctrine in precisely the same manner as I would argue against the Romish doctrine, and have been struck with the fact that their arguments in defence of their sacrifices were as nearly as possible the same as those to be found in every Popish tract in favour of the sacrifice of the mass.

I look upon this doctrine as a very awful apostacy, for it admits the great principle on which the Romanists found their doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, and I know of no abomination in that cage of unclean birds more odious than that. So closely identified do those doctrines appear to me, having the very same objections to encounter, and the very same arguments to support them, that it would be to me a matter of very small surprise if many of these Millenarians closed their career by receiving the doctrines concerning the mass, as taught in the Church of Rome.

These are by no means the only doctrines of the Church of Rome into which too many of the weak but pious clergy of the Established Church have been led by their unhappy adoption of Millenial hypothesis. There are various other particulars in which they have abandoned the standard of Protestantism; they have, many of them, not only deserted us, as already noticed, on purgatory, on miracles, on infallibility, on sacrifice, but they have boldly flung aside many of those passages of Scripture which bear most strongly against the Church of Rome. For example, they have very generally adopted the notion that the "Man of Sin" mentioned in Thessalonians, has no reference to Popery; and it is not a little remarkable that they have adopted the views taken of that passage in the notes of the Rhemish Testament. Again, there are some among them who go so far as to deny that the "apostacy" mentioned in Timothy is descriptive of the Church of Rome, so that they are taking from beneath our feet those portions of Scripture on which Protestants once stood in their conflict with Popery. They have arrived at such a pass, at such a peculiar state of opinion, that at this moment there is but a small, a very small line of separation between much of their system and that of the Church of Rome.

This is certainly a very distressing state of affairs for Protestantism in general, and for the Established Church in particular—for it is to some of the clergy of the Established Church that I especially allude in the foregoing remarks—that they should draw to such a close affinity in sentiment on such important points with the Church of Rome. It is an understood fact that many such persons have in England actually apostatized altogether to Popery

—men of piety, God-fearing and Scripture-loving men, who were led, step by step, by this system, to adopt such principles as I have been noticing, and so gradually to cast aside their objections to Popery itself. May God of his mercy strengthen the hands and souls of our bishops and of all our clergy, to shield our Church and people from such awful delusions!

A CONNAUGHT CURATE.

ADDRESS AT THE CLERICAL BREAKFAST MEETING,

In Dublin, April 11, 1834.

PREVIOUS TO THE MEETING OF THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

BY THE REV. HENRY WOODWARD,

RECTOR OF FETHARD.

“Ye are the salt of the earth,” &c.—*Matt. v. 13.*

Before I commence the observations which I am about to submit to this assembly, I would desire to recal to your recollection (I say to your recollection, for in all probability it has been already known to the most of you) a calculation which was made in the 17th century, with respect to the general and comparative state of religion in this world at that time, and I believe we have sufficient reason for coming to the conclusion that matters are not materially altered since. If the inhabitants of this world were divided into thirty parts, nineteen of these are still in heathen darkness—in total ignorance of the living and true God—worshipping the creature rather than the Creator; either bowing down to the host of heaven, or in abject prostration before idols of impurity and reptiles of the earth: six of these thirty parts are Mahomedans, acknowledging the unity of God, but exalting at the same time the impostor whose name they bear, above the throne and sovereignty of the Redeemer of the world: five parts of these thirty alone remain (that is the sixth part) for nominal Christianity; and when we consider (which I think we fairly may) that one-half of these belongs to that church which requires of its members that they should deliver up into the hands of the clergy those Scriptures which God has given to all; and denies them, at the same time, the fair and inalienable right of examining for themselves whether that sacred record of divine truth does or does not contain the words of eternal life; and then consider that the other half of nominal Christianity is to be divided among the Greek and various other churches of the East, the Armenians and others, more heretical than any part of the western church, and fully as superstitious; and then consider the various grades from Arianism to Atheism, and the strange state of a great part of Protestant Germany, and see how small a proportion of the inhabitants of this world are left for those who hold the faith, the whole faith, and nothing but the faith which was once delivered to the saints.

But let us come again to this small division with the balance

of the sanctuary in our hands, and compare the lives and tempers of those whose faith is orthodox, with the standard of God's holy revelation, and how awful a comment does it afford us on those solemn words of the Saviour, that "strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth to life, and few there be that find it." Go into a large assembly even of the members of our own Church, where there is the form of sound words, and where there are the means of perpetuating right doctrine among the people, and where, in fact, all profess (and that in sincerity, though not in the right manner, and with the right faculty of belief) all that is true, and how few even of them have been crucified unto the world, and have a real experience of the things that belong to their everlasting peace. But it is a most consoling consideration, in the midst of all these very discouraging views of the subject, that of late years—nay, I would almost say of late months (for the work appears to be most rapidly going forward) that in our own country, and our own Church especially, there has been a revival—I will call it a revival—of religion, that actually astonishes the strangers that visit this country, and which must compel all of us to say, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes." Considering then the posts which the clergy of Christ's Church are called upon to occupy—those that are the salt of the salt of the earth, and the light of the light of the world—those that are to be the guides and pastors of that part of Christ's Church which is every day ascending in the comparative scale—I say what must I feel, and how humbled must I feel in being placed here to occupy this station? But I have been called to it, and therefore it is my duty, humbled as I may feel, and unworthy as I may feel, to submit to you such considerations as appear to me to befit the present occasion. What a sight do I now see? How large a proportion of the influential ministers of Ireland are in this room? On the whole, what a chosen band I am addressing! Really I cannot help, first of all, from the bottom of my heart congratulating you that you are assembled on the present occasion. We have had very trying times of late; but, God be praised, we have passed through the ordeal, and came out purified. I might say, in the words of the apostle, that "we have been troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we have been persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed." Nay, I might go a few verses farther, and say, have we not had some experience of the truth, that though our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, though we had no human supports, though all the ties that bound us to this world were broken, and every support we had from this world's power and this world's authorities was withdrawn, yet we ascertained our immovable foundation—we ascertained that our city has God for its maker and builder, and that though this earthly house of our tabernacle were dissolved, we have had a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. We have ascertained our spiritual character, and our spiritual strength; we have ascer-

tained where it is that our power lies, and that it lies not in man, but in God. I say that if things go forward as they have hitherto done, the time may come when we may apply to ourselves other words of the same apostle, when our revival shall approach almost to what may be called a resurrection; and when comparing the state of our church with what it once was, we may say, "It was sown in corruption, it was raised in incorruption; it was sown in weakness, it was raised in power; it was sown a natural body, it was raised a spiritual body." • Yes, (blessed be God, and glory be to our great Head and great Protector,) after all, the times have worked well for us; for if we had not gone through trials, in all probability we had not been collected together in such an assemblage this day.

It appears to me, nevertheless, to be one of the most remarkable instances of the goodness, forbearance, and condescension of God, that he is pleased to make use of such instrumentality as he often does for the good of his people. Nay, that his blessings will sometimes seem to mark out as his peculiar favourites, those of whom each individual who looks into his own heart will only wonder that he has not been long since cast off as a withered branch, or cut down as a mere cumberer of the ground. Is there any person here to-day who, when he compares himself with what he knows he ought to be—when he compares himself with that standard and that rule which he knows to be his true and only guide, with that Word which is to judge him at the last day, is not ready to cover his face in shame and confusion—when he considers himself not only as the purchase of the Redeemer's sufferings and the Redeemer's blood; but sees also the chief Shepherd of the sheep setting an example to all of us in laying down his life for the sheep. When we consider the vows that are upon us, and when we come to close self-examination, as to the manner in which we have performed those vows, can we but be filled with wonder and astonishment at the long-suffering of God—at that Being who has not cast us from him as his enemies, but has owned us as his people and the sheep of his pasture? O may we make up in humility what we feel that we want in every thing else. In whatever spirit angels who have never lost their first estate may go forth on their high ministrations, in no other spirit can we, my brethren, expect a blessing upon our work, than in that spirit of deep humility which would incline and dispose us to cast ourselves even beneath the very feet of those whom we invite and beseech, in Christ's stead, to be reconciled unto God. But, my beloved brethren, humility is not to be considered in the light of a compensation: it is not to be put in the place of a sincere, ardent, and persevering desire to fulfil all righteousness: and knowing our sufficiency to be of God alone, yet to desire in all things to be ensamples to the flock, and to go before them into those pastures in which we would desire them to feed; to hold forth the Word of Life, not only in our doctrine and teaching, but also to exemplify it in our lives and in our practice. There

is something in the very expressions here, "salt of the earth," and "light of the world," which denotes that we are ourselves to aim at attaining to such a state of holiness as that we may be meet for the Master's use; and that we may act, not merely by bringing something extraneous, as it were, into the field of duty, but by being ourselves the fitted channels of conveyance; so that we may be the instruments through whom the Lord can act with renewing and holy influence on our people. It is not said that we are to be distributors of the salt, or setters forth of the light, but we ourselves are to be the "salt" and the "light." Who, I say, is sufficient for these things? Our comfort is that our sufficiency is of God. But I say that the man who does not go forth in the spirit of an unconquerable desire that he himself may be a setter-forth of the glory of God, by manifesting what the grace of God can do, by what it has effected in his instance—who does not feel a readiness to devote himself, body, soul, and spirit, to the service of his great Master, and to the salvation of souls—goes not forth in a right spirit. I say that no man has, in the full sense of the term, a right mission, or is sent of God, unless he can teach that which he experimentally knows, and testify that which his own eyes have been opened to see. No human institution—no rites, however sacred, or usages, however ancient—no imposition of hands—can light up the spark of God's Holy Spirit within the soul. Whatever the virtue of these positive institutions may be, they cannot give the unction from above; and the man that goes forward in any spirit, except a spirit of entire devotedness to his Master, has not been sent of God, neither is his mission a mission from the Holy Ghost: the salt has no savour; and such an one, pretending to that to which he had no right or legitimate claim, is only fit to be cast out and trodden under foot of men. Oh! it is cheering to my heart and soul that I am addressing a body of clergy like the present. When I look back twenty or thirty years, and consider how hopeless it would have been then to attempt to collect a body of clergymen who would have heard such suggestions with any thing but contempt and scorn; and when I believe in my heart that the sense of this large assembly is, that of all the human beings who have earned for themselves contempt, none deserve it more than a clergyman who is living unsuitable to his profession, by mingling in the vicious or frivolous pursuits of this world, and who thus spends his whole life, endeavouring to aggravate and promote the very diseases which it is sent to cure. My reverend brethren, I have observed, as you must all have done, that in some periodical publications an observation has been made, and one of very frequent occurrence in the religious world—it is this, that in proportion to the exertions that are made, and to the instrumentality that is at work in our body, the return of fruit has been comparatively small; that while so many able and earnest preachers have been going forth, and spreading the knowledge of the Saviour's name from one end of the country to the other, so few conversions

are made, and so little answerable results have been experienced. It has, I say, been put forth and proposed as a matter of consideration, and as one which demands investigation; the thoughts of religious people have been called to the point, and they have been requested to make known what might be the result of their communications with each other on the subject. Those who have the best opportunity of knowing it, have ascertained the fact, that there has not been a proportionate return of fruit and of success for the pains that have been taken, and for the instrumentality which is now in operation: and surely this appears to me to be as suitable a subject for your consideration to-day as can well present itself. I know that the race is not always to the swift, nor the battle with the strong; and that the history of the Christian Church furnishes abundant instances, when such a disproportion of success to suitable instrumentality presented itself. But still, unquestionably, wherever there appears a check of that kind, it should have the effect of calling us to deep consideration, to know where the hitch may be, where the defect is, or what it is that lets or stands in the way; for if we can, in any degree, discover where the hindrance is, we may discover also where the remedy is to be found. Is it on the whole that right doctrine is not preached? This, I rejoice in saying, I am convinced is not the cause. It is my belief that those who now go forward in the Home Mission, as well as those who, on a more confined scale, endeavour to preach beyond the limits of their own parish the unsearchable riches of Christ, deliver faithfully the whole counsel of God; and without that no blessing can be expected. Unless we preach a free salvation; unless we preach the forgiveness of sins, through the merits and through the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ; unless we preach a finished salvation, ready at this moment, in all things well-ordered and sure, requiring nothing more on the part of those to whom it is offered, than to hold forth their hand, and take and eat of the tree of life, and live for ever—unless we preach this salvation fully and freely, without any incumbrances on it, and at the same time hold forth the indispensable necessity of endeavouring to perfect holiness, in the fear of the Lord—of endeavouring to become meet for the inheritance of the saints in light, unless we preach a free forgiveness on the one hand, and the necessity of holiness on the other—unless we give the whole Gospel, the whole counsel of God, we cannot, assuredly, expect any blessing. But, as I said before, these doctrines are preached by that portion of our Clergy that are now going forth: and still the success is not answerable, and still the fruit which might reasonably be expected is not found. Oh! may it be our desire to endeavour by prayer, by increased watchfulness, by a daily and hourly endeavour, through the grace of God, to subdue the sins which we deplore within us, to become pure in heart, lovers of prayer, and men whose spirits will habitually ascend to God. Oh may any want of success which has hitherto been experienced, and which, perhaps, has been

sent with a merciful intention of giving us a call to ascend still higher in the divine life. Oh may this lead us to the deep conviction, that the best way to act upon the minds of others is to leave those channels open by which the Spirit of God can act upon us. It is a law of man's nature, both of his higher and lower nature, that whatever he is in himself, he has a constant tendency to promote in the minds of others. The command of the Almighty God, in man's first creation, to increase and multiply, applies also to new creation in Christ Jesus. There is a tendency in man to spread around images of himself, and therefore, when a man is living so as to co-operate with God, he is, even where he does not intend it, spreading a holy, peaceful, and blessed influence around; and, on the other hand, how awful is the consideration, that the man who is living in sin is, even where he has not the least suspicion of it, diffusing its evils around him. As the Sun of Righteousness declines, as he goes down, as it were, upon his soul, his own dark shadow lengthens, that shadow which is the awful image of the widely-extended and far-spread ruin of which he is the author, even where he least intends it. Oh may we endeavour so to live under the lovely, peaceful, and blessed influences of that religion of which we are the ministers, that our light may so shine before those to whom we are sent, that they may see the fruits, and see how holy and how happy Christianity can render a man; how it can raise him above this world, and how it can anticipate his eternal state of being, and touch the springs of joy within his soul, manifesting itself to him as the power of God to his salvation; not merely a promised salvation, or a future blessing, but a present salvation. The image of God within his soul gives him substantial happiness, life, and liberty, assimilating him to the inhabitants of those blessed regions, to which every one is in sure progress who has this dawn of the eternal day within him. Now that there is a want of that fruit which might be reasonably expected, is a thing which appears to be admitted; and if we try to remedy the defect only by increased exertion, it will be but increased failure; and if we are to look for the remedy in doctrine, we must either look for new doctrines (which God forbid) or repeat the same doctrines over and over again, while the complaint is, that this has not produced the desired effect. No; let us seek the remedy where even failure as to others must be the most unspeakable blessing to ourselves, but failure as to others it cannot be.

Let us consider this temporary check an intimation from God to ascend higher and higher, that our horizon, our cheering horizon, may be enlarged, and then the sphere of our operations will be proportionably increased. I speak with profound respect to this assembly. I trust it cannot be conceived that because I have spoken sincerely, and without reserve, that I am wanting in due respect to those whom I address. God forbid, my reverend and beloved brethren, that you should conceive that I

mean, by these observations, to imply that there is any want in the case, except what you yourselves must feel. Yes, my friends, you are earnest and anxious, I doubt not, that you yourselves may come nearer and nearer to the blessed fountain of truth, not only because to do so you feel to be worth more than ten thousand worlds to yourselves, but because you are convinced that it is the best means of bringing your beloved people to those green pastures, and leading them beside those still fountains of living water, where I trust you daily, morning and evening, and at noon-day, hold communion with your God. I shall now submit to the consideration of this meeting another point: there are at present a select number of devoted and conscientious men, who have been led to the conclusion that the profession of the Gospel requires of us, as the followers of the Saviour, who had not where to lay his head, and followers, in a subordinate sense, of those that gave up every thing, and embraced poverty and disgrace, and thought not their lives dear to themselves, so that they might follow in the steps of their crucified Redeemer—they feel, and in the depths of their hearts are persuaded, that there is a call to all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, to be made conformable, not only to the meekness and lowliness of his soul, but to the great humility of his outward circumstances: they say, what business have the followers of a crucified Redeemer with the rich things of this life? What business have men, who ought to be dead to all below, with the riches, and honours, and distinctions of this world? Now it appears to me that this error, while it shews the sincerity of the men who hold it, and while I cannot help loving and honouring the men who act upon it, I conceive to be an error calculated to do the most widely extended harm, because I conceive, in the first place, (and I have made observations in some instances upon it,) that it leads men to trifle with matters of duty, inasmuch as many of those who hold these opinions never think of putting them into practice. Nay, I have known offence given by a clergyman who preached against these doctrines with all mildness, to a person in the possession of fortune and high rank, who entertained some fleeting idea that the thing ought to be done. This clergyman spoke what some would consider unpopular language; for the person who boldly puts forward the opinion that a man should live according to the station in which God in his providence has placed him, takes what might be considered not the popular, but the unpopular side of the question. The individuals who entertain these erroneous notions, take it for granted that because the poor have been spoken of as having the Gospel preached to them, that in external matters the followers of Christ ought to be a poor and despised class, and that they are to be externally separated from the providential arrangements of society. Now, I say that although I love and respect those who put forth these opinions, and act upon them, yet I conceive that the opinions themselves are calculated to do a great deal of mis-

chief. When I see a man holding a situation which enables him to provide for his family according to the station in which they lived, and when I see such a man hearing the words of eternal life, and see the tears trickling from his eyes, as I have done, and when I find that it is to be announced to this man that he must give up his situation, and live in an impoverished state, and all this when the man is only beginning to open his eyes on the blessed truth of the Gospel, am I not justified in saying, that such a course is calculated to depress and discourage him, and to fly from that religion in which, if rightly stated to him, he might have found rest to his soul. This is, my brethren, a view which interferes with the spirituality of the Gospel, by giving a wrong interpretation to those very passages in which the depths of the system are to be found, such as "forsaking all," or "leaving" or "hating father and mother, and wife and children, yea, and our own lives also;" these passages, which describe the inward man of the heart, and the deep extrication of the soul from all its adherences to the things of this world, as its rest or happiness—which calls it in spirit, in temper, and in disposition, from the noisy, and turbulent, and busy, and striving children of this world; or which describes the mind that was in Christ Jesus, or the still, calm, movements of God's most Holy Spirit in the soul; to all these passages they give the most superficial interpretation; and the whole results, after all, in nothing more or less than going back to the kind of renunciation of this world which Popery has most abundantly, in some of the orders of that church, exemplified. And let me now conclude with that which, perhaps, I should have commenced with, and that is, calling your attention very briefly to the consideration of that society, to promote the interests of which we have been assembled here, and are again to meet this day—I mean the Church Missionary Society—and if so manifest an improvement has been effected in the Established Church, one great means of it has been the Church Missionary Society. I believe all the Societies have contributed towards it, but principally and mainly that Society which was confined to our own body. We owe the Church Missionary Society a deep debt of gratitude: the Established Church has received much from it; and I am convinced that we not only feel it to be our duty, but also that we feel and know it to be our interest, to forward the operations of that Society. The times are dark and mysterious; where God is leading us we know not: great preparations appear to be making, but to what point the Almighty will order his forces we know not. Soldiers are every day enlisting—the ranks of the armies of the living God are filling up—but what the word is to be, or where the point of march is to be, we know not: we are all to live in a waiting attitude; we ought all to live in such a state, that we shall be ready to march at any moment, or go to any point, the Lord shall call us to. I do say that there are such appearances in the present state of things as would lead us to expect some

great revival, which would extend far beyond the limits of this country. I do see that the Church of Ireland is rapidly advancing towards such a state of equipment as seems likely to fit it for engaging in a much wider scene of action than is presented to it here. God is raising up a ministry, and where he is to send them let us leave to himself; and God knows how far the Church Missionary Society, and the Church of Ireland may be in progress to mutual approximation, so that both may identify at last. Let us all, at least, my beloved brethren, let us all put ourselves into the Lord's hands; let us all place ourselves at his disposal; and, Oh! let us more and more become men of prayer: the fervent and effectual prayer of one righteous man availeth much; and, Oh! what may the prayers of those effect whom the Lord seems, in an especial manner, to be owning? And Oh! what blessings may the prayers of this body that I now see before me, draw down? O, my beloved brethren, my reverend friends, may we all so live that we shall at last meet again in those blessed regions where the faithful minister will be surrounded by many of his flock; where every one who has been brought to the belief of the truth through his instrumentality, shall be found rejoicing in God, and blessing the minister as the subordinate means of bringing them to this unspeakable blessedness, where those who have brought many to righteousness shall shine as the stars, for ever and ever. When I consider that I am addressing the ministers of several flocks, O may God Almighty grant, that I myself may feel such a re-action from those who are now around me, and to whom I am endeavouring to give feeble utterance to the sincere sentiments of my heart and soul—may I feel myself the benefits which I ought to derive from this meeting; and, finally, my brethren, may the Lord, through all the trials and troubles of this changing shifting scene of life, so guide us, with his good hand, that not one single soul of us shall be missing in the day when he shall make up his jewels. Amen.

NOTE.—We are obliged to the Conductor of the DUBLIN CHRISTIAN JOURNAL for the above Report of Mr. Woodward's Address, and can vouch for the accuracy of the reporter.—EDITOR.

THE NATURE AND ATTRIBUTES OF THE CHURCH. *

We are glad to find the *controversy*, κατ' ἐξοχήν, that with Rome, not entirely dead; and we receive an addition to our pleasure when we find the Protestant part of it where it ought to be, in the hands of the National Clergy. Mr. Collins has been forced forward by the notorious Father Maguire,† and has used the occasion as an opportunity for bringing again before the public the great subjects of the infallibility of the Church, and the right of private judgment, on which we said, long since, that the entire controversy rested. If there be no infallible living, speaking, tribunal in the Church, then the right of private judgment is forthwith established; or, *e contra*, if private judgment, or the prerogative of judging of religion, as an individual and personal matter, be established, then the dogma of an infallible judge vanishes into thin air, and takes its place with Astolpho's wits in the moon, or may be considered, with other results of the same system, as "*Chimæra bombinans in vacuo*." Mr. Collins has not neglected or overlooked other points connected with the controversy, and his little book may be recommended as a manual, containing in a nervous and pointed style, most important and useful information; replying to the vague, false, and abusive language of his opponent, with temper, candour, learning and piety.

As a specimen of the manner and information, we extract an interesting passage, concerning the Confession of Augsburg, which may be new to *some* of our readers; while the falsification of authority which distinguishes Mr. Maguire can be new to none who are acquainted with Popish controvertists:

"When I first read your paragraph respecting the Confession of Augsburg, I admit I was startled at your conclusion, 'so by the public confession of faith of all the early Protestants, the *Roman* Church differed in no *article of faith* from the Scriptures, or from the Catholic Church;' but a second reading removed the mystery, and converted my amazement into

* The Nature and Attributes of the Church, and the Right of Private Judgment, as taught by the United Church of England and Ireland, Explained and Defended; and the Doctrines of the Church of Rome on these subjects Disproved, together with Observations on Subordinate Points of Roman Catholic Controversy; in Three Letters to the Rev. Thomas Maguire, being a Reply to his Review of the Author's Letter, entitled "*Priests Detected*." By the Rev. JAMES COLLINS, A.M., Curate of Cavan. Dublin: Gibbon and Overend, 7, Capel-street. 1834.

† Had the Church of Rome no person to put forward, as her representative during Lent in the metropolis, except this person? Verily she must be hard run in her attempts at getting money.

pity for a man who could commit so gross an abuse of public confidence as you have perpetrated in that paragraph. How will the unlearned reader be surprised when he is informed, that the document to which you refer consists of twenty-eight articles or sections; the first twenty-one contain those in which the Protestants considered the Church of Rome would agree with them; the seven last those in which they differed.

"How then, I say, will the unlearned reader be surprised to hear that it is from the last article of the *former* division, viz., that containing the articles in which the Protestants hoped the Church of Rome would agree with them, that you quote the words on which your argument rests, as if that were the concluding article of the whole confession; whereas it is only the last of those on which, it was hoped, the parties would agree—those on which they disagreed follow after!! Ah! Sir, how wretched must that cause be, that requireth such support, and how lost to every feeling that ennobles the human mind, must that man be, who could bring himself to render it.

"I said above, that the first 21 articles contained those in which the Protestants *conceived* or hoped that an agreement subsisted between them and the Church of Rome; but they were speedily undeceived, for of these, the Roman Catholic party altogether rejected Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 20 and 21, containing the most essential points of Christian doctrine, together with, as might be expected, the whole of the second part of the document—namely, that "*De Abusibus.*" Nos. 2, 11, 12, 15, and 19, they partly received and partly rejected, and No. 13, being one of those that they received, (as Du Pin informs us) they judged defective, because the Reformers did not acknowledge the Sacraments to be seven—(Ecc. Hist. 16 cent. 22 chap.)—whether, therefore, the Confession of Augsburg bears testimony to the orthodoxy of the Church of Rome in Luther's day, will now be apparent.

"But even this is not all—I have now before me this same Augsburg Confession, and I find that you have absolutely cut a passage in two, to serve your purpose, quoting the former part, and rejecting the latter. The whole quotation is as follows.—"*Hæc fere summa est doctrinæ apud nos, in qua sermi potest, nihil inesse, quod discrepet a Scripturis, vel ab ecclesia Catholica, vel ab ecclesia Romana, quatenus ex Scriptoribus nota est.*" Which I thus translate—'This is almost the sum of our doctrine, in which it may be seen, that there is nothing which will be found to differ from the Scriptures, or from the Catholic Church, or from the Roman Church, *as far as it is known from authors.*' In an edition of the Confession, published A.D. 1540, i. e. nine years after the first, and which seems a sort of paraphrase thereof, the last clause is stated more fully thus, '*quatenus ex probatis Scriptoribus,*' as far as it is known from her *standard* authors,' and, let me ask, who does not know that the Church of Rome, as known from her standard authors, 15 years before the commencement, and 33 years before the termination of the Council of Trent, is a very different thing indeed from what it is at the present day. The creed of Pius, and the decrees of Trent—the abominations of the Christian religion—had then no existence.

"But I have not done with this quotation even yet. This 21st article,

from which you quote, is entitled 'De cultu Sanctorum,' 'of the honor of the saints.' Our churches, with the fullest unanimity, hold that the memory (or example) of the saints should be held out, that we may imitate their faith and holiness, according to their vocation, as the Emperor may imitate the example of David, in waging war for the expulsion of the Turks—for each is a king. But Scripture does not teach the invocation of saints, or the seeking of aid from saints, because it holds out Christ to us as the mediator, propitiator, priest, and intercessor. He is to be invoked, and he has promised that he will hear our prayers, and it approves of this service most particularly, namely, that in all afflictions he should be invoked. 'If any man sin,' &c. 'This is almost the sum,' &c. Here, then, Sir, up to the very words you quote, is a specific rejection of saint-worship, and an explicit declaration that Christ is the only mediator—the only intercessor, and yet, in the teeth of all this, you have the effrontery to say "So, by the public congregation of faith of all the early Protestants, the Roman Church differed in no one article of faith from the Scriptures or from the Catholic Church." One would suppose you imagined the copies of the Confession of Augsburg to be as scarce as Pope Sixtus's Bibles, when you venture on such assertions. Their declaration was, respecting the Roman Church, '*quatenus ex probatis Scriptorum nota est*'—and the ultimate rejection of the very article you refer to, by the Papal party, proves distinctly, how much the Roman Church in reality differed, even then, from the Roman Church 'as known from approved authors.' Thus, then Sir, I have convicted you of three several acts of dishonesty respecting one single quotation—and thus I leave you at the bar of public opinion to receive its righteous sentence.

"In your 108th page, you again refer to the Confession of Augsburg, and I regret to say, with even greater dishonesty than before. Your assertion in this instance is, that if we reject the Sacrifice of the Mass, we must reject the great and mighty Luther, and all the early reformers. For in the Confession of Augsburg, drawn up by Luther and Melancthon, and subscribed by all the leading Protestants of Germany, Article de Abusibus, the following memorable passage occurs: 'Our churches are falsely accused of having abolished the Mass; for we retain the Mass, and celebrate it with the highest degree of reverence; even all the former ceremonies are mostly observed; the only existing difference consists in a few German hymns added to the Latin, to edify the people.' May I ask, Sir, have you ever seen the Confession of Augsburg, from which you affect to quote so flip-pantly? I would be induced to think, and I would say to *hope* not—for otherwise I know not how you will bear up against the discoveries which it now devolves upon me to open to the public. . . . In the first of the seven articles, (de Abusibus) it is declared by the first Protestants, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be given to the people in *both kinds*, thus reciting their custom, '*Laicis datur utraque species sacramenti in com-munione Domini*,' &c. . . . And in the close of the article, 'and because the division of the Sacrament does not agree with the institution of Christ, it is customary for us to omit the procession which heretofore was usual.' 'An opinion gained ground, which increased the number of private Masses to an

infinite degree, namely, that Christ by his passion, made satisfaction for original sin, and instituted the Mass, in which an oblation is made for daily transgressions, mortal and venial.'

" 'Of these opinions our people have given notice that they are contrary to the Scriptures, and mar the glory of Christ's passion.'

" Also the Scripture teaches that 'we are justified before God, through faith in Christ;' that when we believe, our sins are forgiven for Christ's sake. Now if the Mass take away the sins of the living and the dead, by the act of its celebration—justification comes by virtue of Masses, and not from faith, which the Scripture does not warrant.

" Such is the doctrine of the confession of Augsburg as to the nature of the Sacrament. Here, then, the Protestants declare, that they administer the Sacrament in both kinds to the laity—that they reject the procession of the host—that in their opinion, the view of the Mass, which regards it as an offering for daily transgressions, mortal and venial, and for the sins of the living and the dead, is contrary to Scripture, and dishonorable to the passion of Christ—and yet, with all this before you, merely because the word '*Mass*' occurs in the paragraph you quote, you deliberately affirm, that those who reject the Mass of the Church of Rome, must reject 'all the early reformers;' and quote the very document which contains the above quotations as a proof of your assertion. I say that such conduct is an outrage on all the rules of common honesty, and an offence in the region of literature, such as may challenge the world for a parallel, from the days of Adam to the present."

LETTER FROM MR. MONCK MASON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—I can well believe it to have been a surprise to you to find the letter, which was appended to your last Number, identified, by the paging and the advertisement affixed to it, with the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER. It is not easy to discover what right it had to a connection with such a title; and the more so, as your publication commenced with a sweet sermon on *meekness*, which proved to me, that although the storm raged around your bark, the spirit of the Lord Jesus rested within it; and I feel thankful that, while my spirit was much agitated by the tempest, there was a *word* in that discourse which spoke to it with power, “Peace, be still!”

I thank you for your permission to occupy a few of your pages in answer to that letter; but I shall beg leave, upon mature consideration, to decline it, and confine myself to a very few paragraphs of necessary explanation. Your publication is not the proper arena for this discussion; and I especially deprecate the referring of any part of the solemn question of the purity or corruption of what professes to be God's Holy Word, to the decision or influence of public opinion, agitated through your pages. The subject is now put into the only proper train of fair inquiry and just determination; and, as far as I am concerned, or can assist, the Christian public shall have all reasonable satisfaction; whosoever among them desires to have a copy of my printed answer to Dr. Orpen, on the use of the word *aukrighe* to express *repentance*, may have it by applying to me.

I confess that, in a personal point of view, I did feel a just degree of jealousy at being exhibited as a breaker of the peace between Christian brethren, and a deep indignation at being accused of disingenuousness and imposture; but, Sir, I shall only observe, as to the first of these charges, that it certainly does not become one who had first applied to me in print the epithet *contemptible*, by an implication which it was impossible to misunderstand; and, as to the latter, although it is vain to meet such an accusation by a mere denial, for he that is untrue will not hesitate to defend himself by falsehood or evasion, yet to the entire of the obligation, expressible or implied, I must assert my unqualified contradiction, as far as motive or material fact are concerned. My proofs, my reasons, and my documents, shall be exhibited to the satisfaction of any Christian persons who may be moved, by the boldness of Dr. Orpen's assertions, to doubt or to suspect me. Should any of your correspondents of *that character*, and not residing in Dublin, desire it, he can be satisfied through the medium of any common friend. I shall nominate, for instance, any member he may please of the twenty-one individuals that compose the Committee of the Hibernian Bible

Society; but in all such inquiries, I must abide strictly by the scriptural directions given in 1 Cor. vi. 1—7.

I shall only observe respecting one *appearance* of disingenuous suppression, which I think I am called upon to account for; it is of a part of certain resolutions, presented by the Kingscourt masters and pupils of the Irish Society, at their annual meeting, A.D. 1826. In fact, the part withheld did not contain their present sentiments, and therefore could not have been quoted by me with truth as doing so. In particular, the Rev. Mr. Winning, their superintendant, informed me, that the principal reason why these people, in the resolutions above mentioned, stated that, in the year 1826, they found the Irish Testament agreeing, "most with the Rhemish," was, that the copy of the Irish Testament they then used was the 12mo of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which contained the Popish rendering of John ii. 4, a rendering which has since been altered in the Bibles now in their hands, to one agreeable with our Protestant version, and so presented to the public in the octavo and minion Irish Bibles. I shall accompany this explanation with the remark, that the old objection in Robert Boyle's time was, not that the Irish version was too close to the Rhemish or to the Latin vulgate, but the contrary, and was couched thus: "It (the Irish Bible) would take the more with the people, *because the priests should have the less to object against it*, if they kept as near the vulgar Latin, WHICH IN THIS IS NOT DONE, as the text will bear." (See Robert Boyle's Letters to Provost Marsh.)

I am, Sir, your's faithfully,

HENRY JOS. MONCK MASON.

LINES ON THE CRUCIFIXION.

"Jesus when he had cried again with a loud voice yielded up the ghost."
Matt. xxvii. 50.

Sleep now, oh earth; sleep on! for never more,
 What throbs soe'er convulse thee, shall a sound
 Pass, like that cry, thy trembling bosom o'er.
 Never again! through the abyss profound,
 Shaking the stars upon its awful way,
 Even as a blast might shake the forest leaves
 Its piercing love went up:—but terror lay
 On thee, blood-sprinkled: (yea, thy dust believes
 What man regards not.*) Silence was in heaven—
 Archangels veiled their faces in their wings.
 Then burst that song from multitudes forgiven
 That now for ever and for ever rings,
 Here through his people's hearts—there on celestial strings.
 Then "it was finished:"—All for which thine orb
 Yet keeps its place amid the worlds of God;
 All for which darkness faileth to absorb
 Thy wretched breast, where once he breathed and trod,
 Was finished then; and now sleep on and rest!
 And fear no more that over thee the sky
 Shall murmur horror:—it was once expressed
 By all creation then,—when daylight's eye
 Looked down on Calvary, and the startled dead
 Woke to that loud and melancholy cry.—
 Fear not poor world! it was for thee he bled;
 For thee arose triumphantly on high
 That pleading voice, and drooped in death that head,
 And closed those wearied eyes whose tears on thee were shed!

Thy wise, thy wicked trouble thee, and yet
 What is their hum of impotence to thee?
 That cry alone, thy mountains ne'er forget—
 That cry alone shall ever awe thy sea:
 And weak, as near the thunder of its waves,
 Are human words to us whose souls have heard—
 Hear still that cry.—Do thou with all thy graves
 Sleep on in sunshine, by their breath unstirr'd,
 Till once again a shout, a trumpet blast,
 The last, the loudest thou shalt wake to hear,
 Shall rend the heavens, and downward through the vast
 And echoing Infinite descending clear,
 Shall bid thy wise be dumb, thy ransomed cease to fear!

E. M. H.

* "The earth did quake and the rocks rent."—*Matt.* xxvii. 51. and
Luke, xix. 40.

THE TRUE VINE.

"And they came unto the brook of Eshcol, and cut down from thence a branch with one cluster of grapes."—*Numbers*, xiii, 23.

Sister! have not we, too, come
To a brook like Eshcol's own,
Rich with many a lovely cluster
Of a vine that stands alone?
Truth is reached: its crystal waters
Whisper at our weary feet;
And fruit, like words, lone bending o'er us,
To our souls are sweet.

And oh! the peaceful "Tree of Life,"
Whence they thus so meekly stoop,
So kindly in a world of strife,
Where gentle spirits droop;
On our hearts its shadow lieth
Soft and clear as on a stream;
And we see the land of promise,
Not as in a dream.

One simple, graceful branch to-day,
One bright, redundant cluster only,
Enough for thought, we bear away
Back through deserts lonely.
Back through this world's fruitage poor,
And its mean degenerate vines,
Can we, can we turn to them,
While this in memory shines?

By its living sweetness deep,
We will on and win that land!
Not a doubt shall o'er us creep
For the weakness of our hand;
Not earth's mighty hosts of war
Shall affright us as we press
Onward to our pleasant home,
Through the howling wilderness.

We will sit beneath that vine
Which o'er us spread from far above,
Drooping, with a grace divine,
Its lowly boughs of love.
Is it not already ours?
Our beautiful celestial Tree,
Whose glory overshadoweth heaven,
Whose root is in eternity!

E. M. HAMILTON.

TO ———

" Though thou exalt thyself as the eagle, and though thou make thy nest among the stars, thence will I bring thee down saith the Lord."—
Obadiak, 4.

Yes! thou indeed art as an eagle cleaving
High solitudes profound!
Thought's mountain summits far beneath thee leaving,
And who of earth shall bring thee to the ground?
Thy wings of intellect are dazzling bright.
Oh! earliest loved! I know not where they soar;
I veil mine eyes before the splendid sight;
I only know that this must once be o'er.

For take thy flight, which hath a glorious seeming,
Upward and upward, wandering through light;
Smile in thy heart at faith's prophetic dreaming,
That aught shall pluck thee from thy sovereign height.
Go to thy throne amid the stars of heaven,
Where death itself shall never touch thy crown!
One dwelleth there: with him if thou have striven,
Shall he not cast thee, like the weakest, down?

Is there around the lofty habitation
Of thy bright spirit any guard from him?
Canst thou defy the inward desolation
With which his wrath all brilliant thoughts can dim?
Hast thou a heart that would not much be wounded
Should burning arrows fall on it like rain?
Should love be crushed, and deepest trust confounded,
And memory's self become unsleeping pain?

And what will then those glorious wings avail thee,
Bleeding, and faint, and powerless to rise;
When all the refuges of this world fail thee,
And coldly glitter the approachless skies?
Oh! ere that hour, "a little child" again
Become in wisdom's renovated youth,
And rise an eagle among fearless men,
For him who is "the Truth!"

1892.

E. M. H.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

IRISH SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of the Irish Society was holden at the Rotunda, on the 17th of March, (Patrick's Day,) the Earl of Roden in the Chair. The several resolutions were moved and seconded by the Hon. and Venerable Archdeacon Pakenham; Robert Bourke, of Hayes, Esq.; the Rev. Messrs. S. Foote, Robt. Winning, Rich. Radcliff, Wm. Kirkpatrick, Thos. Waugh, and Gibson Black; Capt. T. Monck Mason, R.N., and Maurice Collis, Esq.

The deputation of sixteen masters, which is annually sent from the Kingscourt district to attend the general meeting of the Society, appeared upon the platform; but the number of masters and pupils that voluntarily accompanied it increased the sum of Irish peasants to 40: these, as usual, responded to every sentiment of the speakers in the most zealous manner; and one of them was permitted in the name of the rest, to express their own. It appeared clearly to be the determination of these poor people, and of numbers whom they represented, to exercise their natural and unalienable right of reading the Holy Scriptures, and of judging for themselves, unbiassed by the unscriptural influence of men.

The Report stated several highly interesting facts, of which we can particularly note but a few, the more especially, as the document can be had at the office of the Irish Society:

1st. The use of the Irish has led to a great demand for English Bibles, so that, to meet it, a large grant from the Hibernian Bible Society became requisite, and in one day only the Superintendent of Kingscourt district sold 114 of these English Bibles with marginal references, at a reduced price.

2dly. Almost all Irish pupils of the schools are brought into closer contact even with Protestant Clergymen and gentlemen; and frequently meet them, in order to search

together into the Scriptures, and to inquire "whether those things were, so?" And

3dly. A superior grade of spiritual character has commenced to be formed; and one or two devoted and intelligent men have already been appointed from among them, to fulfil the higher duties of Scripture readers in this and other Irish districts.

The summary of operations of the Society appears from the following return of the last quarter. Districts 22, Teachers 423. Pupils 12516, of whom 8810 are adults, 190 are aged above 50, and 1737 are females.

On the 18th a most interesting examination of the masters and scholars abovementioned, about 40 in number, was holden at the Lecture-room of the late Dublin Institution, No. 15, Sackville-street. It lasted about three hours, and was conducted thus: The meeting opened with prayer by the Rev. Simon Foote: the Secretary, Mr. H. Mason, then briefly stated that the object was, to manifest to the Christian public the reality of the progress in scriptural knowledge among the peasantry in the Kingscourt, which they had so often declared in their reports to have been vouchsafed as a blessing on their exertions; and that, with this view, the men then present would be required to give texts from Scripture, to prove in their order, the following fundamental doctrines: 1. The right and duty of reading the Holy Scriptures; and their authority in all spiritual inquiries; 2. The fall of man, and the nature of sin; 3. The recovery or redemption of man; and 4. The fruits of the Spirit, or work of sanctification.

These texts were to be read by them in Irish, and then translated from the Irish text into the English language.

In the examination under the first head an hour passed rapidly away. We shall here present, as a specimen

of their translation of every text upon that head that they quoted and translated from their Irish book; omitting very many which they repeated from memory, out of our English Protestant version.

Isaiah viii. 20. "To the law and to the prophets; if they speak not according to this, it is because there is no light in them."

John v. 39. "Search the Scriptures; for ye yourselves think that in them ye find eternal life, and them are they that give witness of me."

Acts xvii. 11. "And these Jews were more noble than those in Thessalonica; and they received the word with more readiness, searching the Scriptures every day beholding whether these things were true."

2 Tim. iii. 15. "And you, from being a child, you know the Holy Scriptures, which is able to make you wise, through faith, unto salvation."

16. Exactly as in the Protestant English version.

17. "That the man of God may be perfect, properly furnished to do every good work."

Rev. i. 3. "Blessed are them that read, and them that hear the words of this prophecy, and observe the things that are written in it, for the time is present."

John v. 24. "Surely, surely, I tell you, saying, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into badness; but I will alter him from death unto life."

Mark xii. 24. "And Jesus answering said unto them; For this you err astray, because ye don't know the Scriptures, nor the power of God."

Jos. i. 8. "And the book of this law shall not go out of thy mouth; but thou shalt be perusing it both day and night, that thou may observe according to what is written in it, for that way thou wilt prosper and have good success."

John vii. 49. Exactly as in our Protestant version."

Rom. xv. 4. "Before this they were written for our instruction, that

we might have hope, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures."

Rom. i. 16. As in the English Protestant translation.

John xii. 48. "He that despiseth me, and does not take my words to him, hath one that judgeth him. The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day."

1 Pet. i. 10. "The salvation of which the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that would come to you."

11. As in the Protestant version, omitting the word "beforehand."

"Luke xvi. 29. As in the Protestant English.

Deut. vi. 6. The same.

— 7. "And you shall teach them diligently unto thy children; and shalt speak of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down and when you rise up."

— 8. "And you shall tie them upon thine hand, that they may be as frontlets between thine eyes."

Prov. xiii. 13. As in the Protestant English translation.

Without entering into controversy on the subject, it may be remarked, that these translations afford a very fair—a very decided specimen of the purity of a version which has of late been questioned; and must incline to suppose that it does not possess any vicious rendering in doctrinal and important subjects.—Here is an entire range of texts brought forward upon one fundamental point, in a manner quite unpremeditated: the translations given by a variety of simple-minded men, without any object or plan in view, but plainly translating them in such a way that any one, with an English Bible in their hands, however ignorant of the Irish language, could competently judge of how the Irish version conveyed the sense.—Some may be struck with the fact, that the English translations given are palpably afforded by the memory of the persons translating; but this, while it greatly argues for the usefulness of the Irish Society, that has thus accomplished the storing of many a

poor man's mind with texts, even in the English tongue, makes nothing against the view now taken of the subject: for, whether the translation be taken word for word from the Irish, or given from memory from the English, it must equally come as an honest testimony, that the Irish will properly bear that rendering; and is, therefore, as pure a translation as our, in that instance, English Protestant version.

Among about an hundred passages, which these men on this occasion translated from the Irish Bible, all of them concerning the four abovementioned most essential points of doctrine, there was not one of them that did not stand the trial of this test; and we have been informed by Protestant Clergymen, who have now for years been in the habit of meeting with hundreds of Irish pupils in this way, that they never heard of even one instance of error, affecting doctrine, exhibited in their translation into English of the texts of the Irish Bible.

CONSPIRACY TO PROCURE THE EXECUTION OF A PROTESTANT FOR MURDER.

Though the following trial has obtained much publicity, yet we deem it conducive to the best interests of Ireland to place it on record in the *CHRISTIAN EXAMINER*.

A widow lady of the name of Haines was reduced to a situation of painful embarrassment by the refractory conduct of the tithe-haters, among whom was one Daniel Crean, a farmer, who owed her a debt which he refused to pay. Compelled by her exigencies, she resorted to the law, and employed one Wm. Wright, the prison-keeper at Macroom, and a Protestant, to distrain upon this Daniel Crean. Wright appears, by the evidence, to have acted more from feelings of commiseration for the unfortunate lady, than from mere professional motives. But be this as it may, the conduct of Wright was peaceable, conciliatory, and perfectly legal. He seized two cows belonging to Crean, and was in the act

of driving them away, when he was attacked by Crean and his sons, dragged from his horse, beaten upon the head, and otherwise severely injured, when, in his own defence, and when his life was in danger, he fired one of the two pistols with which he was armed, and killed the elder Crean. Crean survived his wound only a few hours, and Wright succeeded in securing his own life by having the other loaded pistol in his possession, which, however, he did not fire. These are the simple and undeniable facts, but they did not transpire until the last moment, when Wright was all but convicted of murder!

But let us proceed with the case as reported.

William Wright was placed at the bar, charged with the murder of Daniel Crean, at Coolsurrahee, on the 4th of January last, by shooting him with a pistol.

The first witness called is one Denis Murphy, who was present when the shot was fired, and who swears that the deceased was walking quietly by the side of the prisoner, and not obstructing him in the slightest degree, when he levelled the pistol and shot him; and that it was not until after he was shot that deceased endeavoured to pull witness from his horse.

Timothy Crean, one of the deceased's sons, was present on the occasion. He swears that his father was "speaking civilly" to the prisoner when he shot his father.

Cornelius Crean, another son, swears that he saw nothing occur between his father and the prisoner, and that his father was doing the prisoner no injury when he shot him.

Daniel Crean, another son, also swears that there was no attempt made to rescue the cows when his father was shot.

To make the case still more clear the dying declaration of the murdered man is produced in court, in which he states that he "never laid hand on the prisoner, and that he was only persuading him to go to the priest's, when he levelled his pistol and shot him."

But now for the defence, and we call attention to it as a painful illustration of the degraded and demoralized state of society in the Roman Catholic districts of Ireland.

Before Crean died he called upon his priest, the Rev. James Burke, R. C. C., as he is styled, and made certain acknowledgments to him, in confidence, of course, which did not transpire, until the prisoner, Wright, upon the foulest evidence ever tendered in a court of justice, was within a hair's-breadth of the gallows. But we must give this part of the case in full:—

"Rev. James Burke, R. C. C., examined.—Saw the deceased the day before his death; the deceased came to his house after he was shot; witness went afterwards to see the deceased at his house with a medical gentleman; is sure the deceased was conscious he was near his death, when he told him the prisoner was driving two of his cows under a civil bill decree. (After a long discussion between counsel, it was decided that the witness's evidence was inadmissible as to the deceased's dying declaration.)

"Cross-examined by Mr. Jackson.—Tell me, Sir, is the prisoner liked by the country people?—I don't know that he's disliked. Did you ever hear he was attacked?—I did not. You swear that positively?—I do. Who was it retained that formidable bar of counsel on the part of the prosecution?—*I did, one of them, out of my own pocket.* Who retained the other?—He was retained by subscription. Who was it got up the subscription?—*I got money from a few persons for it.* Then it was you who raised the subscription?—*It was, from my friends.* Didn't you consider the four counsel for the Crown sufficient for the ends of justice?—I did not. And why, Sir?—Because I had reason to know they'd be interfered with? What reason had you to know it, Sir?—I saw a letter. Who wrote the letter? (Witness to his Lordship.) Am I to tell, my Lord?

"His Lordship.—Certainly.

"Witness.—Then, Mr. Ashe, of, Ashgrove.

"Mr. Jackson.—Whom was the letter to?—To the family of the deceased. What did it state?—That if a certain gentleman was retained as counsel he would withdraw his assistance. And that was the reason you feed an additional counsel this morning?—It was. Did Cornelius Crean tell you he had a hold of the prisoner when his father was shot?—*I don't think I can answer that question.* Come, Sir, you must answer me.—Then, as a priest, I claim the protection of his Lordship. Why? was it in a confession?—It was not. Then, Sir, I insist that you do answer me.—If I must, *he did tell me so.* (*This answer occasioned a great sensation throughout the Court.*) Did he tell you his father had a hold of the prisoner also, and that both were dragging him off his horse when he fired?—(After some hesitation)—*He did!*—(*A low murmur through the whole Court.*)

"Mr. Jackson, (indignantly).—I'll not ask you another question; you may go off the table, Sir.

"It is impossible to convey an idea of the scene which the Court exhibited on hearing the witness's last answer. Amazement was in every countenance. The same feeling seemed to pervade the bench and the bar, the jury and the auditors. Of the immense crowd assembled, each one glanced at his neighbour with a look of indescribable astonishment.

The following is the Chief Justice Doherty's charge, and the conclusion of the trial:—

"Gentlemen of the Jury, under all the circumstances of this case, which for some hours I should have called an anxious case, I do not feel it necessary to delay you any time, as the gentlemen who conduct the prosecution for the Crown have done much in relieving us of the capital part of the charge. The story which Murphy told you showed a case of the most wanton and unprovoked aggression, on the part of the prisoner, that ever presented itself in a court of justice. The prisoner had no se-

curity from that but a confident hope in the protection of Providence, for no human eye was present to tell the story as it really occurred. In that view of the case, to Providence only had the prisoner to look, and every man who hears me must say, that there would be no protection for our lives if the witnesses for the prosecution had succeeded in imposing on the jury the belief that the charge was true. It grieves me most sorely to hear the sacred name of God taken loosely in courts of justice. Did you, gentlemen of the jury, send an innocent person to destruction, and that the notion once went abroad that you believed a story merely because it was sworn to by numerous witnesses, what would be the consequences? This was a most formidable case for some time; men of every age were amongst the persons who came before you as witnesses; and if you believed them, on what could our lives depend for protection, but on the presence of that God, who, in this case extended his aid, and testified (what indeed the Counsel for the Crown admits,) that this was a false and foul conspiracy; and it makes one start to think that, but for that all-seeing Eye, you might have been made the innocent accessories to as foul a murder as ever was attempted to be procured. Gentlemen, I

do from my heart congratulate you on having escaped *that*. Gentlemen, I think it a waste of time to address any further observations to you on this case; for if you believe that the prisoner at the bar was not guilty of murder, then he's not guilty at all. I cannot see how it is a case of manslaughter, for if you believe the witnesses at all, he is guilty of murder, and not of manslaughter. What does Cornelius say to Mr. Burke? That he and his father, the deceased, both had hold of the prisoner when the pistol was fired, which the marks on his wrist clearly go to prove. As to the dying declaration of the father, his Lordship thought it should be looked upon as tainted, like the living evidence of the sons. The prisoner must have been not only a humane man, but a mild and temperate one, for you have it in evidence that he was followed and beaten by Cornelius, though he had the second loaded pistol in his hand. *But there are other persons who ought to stand at that bar, to answer to God and their country for the part which they have acted in this transaction.*

"Immediately on his Lordship finishing his charge, the foreman of the jury handed down the issue, **ACQUITTING THE PRISONER ON ALL THE COUNTS.**"

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
AND
Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXXII. JUNE, 1834. VOL. III.

A SERMON.

“As we have, therefore, opportunity, let us do good unto all men.”—
Gal. vi. 10.

When a preacher endeavours to set faithfully before his hearers that religion has higher demands upon them than, perhaps, the most of them have been in the habit of allowing; that it is not a pliable and convenient system, which will lie by while matters of more consequence are in the way; but that it is no less than the light from heaven—a message from the Lord of life—backed with all the weight which eternity can throw into the scale, and all the authority which God can give it; in short, when it is his object not to amuse his congregation with some ingenious or well-turned periods about vices which they may shun, and virtues which they may practice, while their hearts are far from God; but when he speaks to them as a dying man to dying men; when he, with unsparing hand, would draw aside the curtain, and let in the day-light of eternity upon the darkness of this world, its wisdom, its pursuits, its schemes, and its pleasures; when, in short, a preacher says, what the Bible says, that all compromise is vain, that one thing is needful, that we cannot serve two masters, that we cannot be neutral, that we must choose God or the world, the way to heaven or the way to hell; and that if any man doubt which he has chosen, he has, without knowing it, made the wrong and fatal choice; when, in short, the doctrine delivered from the pulpit mainly is that half measures and partial reformations are not what the Scripture calls for; but a new creation, an entire change, the mind that was in Christ Jesus, death to the world, the kingdom of God within us, heaven opened in the soul; when this testimony is plainly borne, it is natural to suppose that it must set men thinking. For some time they may have supposed that they and the preacher are quite agreed; and think

that he has only a new, or odd, or violent way of saying what they would express more calmly. But, however, if he perseveres in stating plain, uncompromising, scriptural truth, many will begin to observe that, right or wrong, there is a decided difference of sentiment between them and the preacher; that he means something, let it be erroneous, or let it be true, which they cannot bring to square by any ingenuity with their own system; that he has something in his view, which has not been in their view; that he is every Sunday returning to the charge, and representing their accounts as unsettled with heaven, and that the things that are God's are not rendered unto God.

In this state, some are apt to say, What is all this about? What point is he driving at? What steps are we to take? What, after all, is it that he would have us do?

Now let it be observed that there are two different frames of mind in which this kind of inquiry may be made. If it is asked in the temper and spirit of the newly converted Paul, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" or of the Philippian jailor, "What shall I do to be saved?" to such an inquirer we have but one short answer to give; we have only to announce to him the glad tidings of great joy. Let the past life of such an one have been what it may; let his present sense of guilt and misery be red like crimson; let shame and confusion cover his face; let clouds overhang his soul, and his heart be in heaviness within him; let him but ask this question in sincerity of heart, and the answer is, All things are forgiven to the penitent—all things are possible to him that believeth. Let him hear our Saviour's invitation, "Come unto me all ye that travail and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." It is not the cold and comfortless assurance, that if you now begin a new life, and if that life is spared, and if the good works you do in future outweigh your past iniquities, you may be forgiven, and be saved. But the message is, turn now to God, and all is pardoned; all things are now ready; there is no fiery ordeal to be passed; but the transition is immediate. You may put forth your hand this moment to the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever. There is a short cut from that deep and miry road of toil, and misery, and danger, into the ways of pleasantness and paths of peace; into the sunshine of God's favour; into the confines of never-ending day, and of everlasting love. These are the glad-tidings to the meek. This is the message which heals the broken-hearted. Nor need we fear to deliver it freely; for where this message really reaches, it converts the soul. God's goodness, where there are eyes to see it, melts the heart of stone; and the blood of Christ not only expiates our guilt, but purges the enlightened conscience from the works of sin. These doctrines, I grant, may be abused; and he that expects salvation, without turning with all his heart to holiness and to God, does abuse them to his own destruction. But the truth is, that God's mercies in Christ Jesus, when really laid on, cannot be abused. They must produce all righteousness as in-

evitably as the sun must illuminate the heavens. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; and this tree of God's own planting will ever have its fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.

But there is another spirit in which it is sometimes said of a preacher, What would he have us to do? It is a way of throwing on him the charge, that instead of offering plain, sensible, and practical advice, he only puzzles his hearers with high-flown rhapsodies, and sets before them airy spiritual notions which have nothing tangible or palpable about them, so as to be reduced to practice or brought forth into real life. It is, in fact, as much as to say, what after all is it that we do not do? We are living reputably; we are satisfied with ourselves; we do not know where we are deficient; and here are vague and general insinuations that we are fundamentally in error. Where, then, are we in error? Let him bring forth his strong reasons, and show in what we are deficient—what, in a word, we are to do.

I answer, you have in a few years, or months, or days, to prepare for eternity. Is a man at a loss to know what he is to do, or rather does he think he has but a trifling matter on hands, when he is just embarking on an endless voyage?—when he is shortly to stand before God, and account for every minute of his time?—when for every idle word he is to give account in the day of judgment?—when, according to the works done in the body, he is to rise to life eternal, or to be cast into everlasting fire?

But to be more particular, you all profess to believe, and you are right in believing, that the Bible is the only sure and infallible guide of souls to heaven. Have you, then, ever seriously read the Bible? Have you ever sat down to it with the attention which you would pay to a letter on your own business, or a legal deed by which your property was to be secured or conveyed? If not, here then is an important work for you to do. Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life. But hasty running over the Scriptures will not do. Dwell on its most important parts. Compare yourself with it; and ask yourself how you answer to that unerring standard. It is said, for instance, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Are you poor in spirit? Are you lowly in your own eyes? Would you sooner bear the grossest insult, than sin against God in resenting it? If not, what do you read in Scripture, but that yours is not the kingdom of heaven—that the salvation promised in the Gospel is not yours? Again it is said, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Are you pure in heart? Do you hate the remains of corrupt affection and depraved nature, that may still cleave to you against your will? Or do you freely indulge in loose thoughts, and abstain from loose practices, from want merely of opportunity, and from the fear of man? Well, then, what warrant is there from the Sacred Word that you will ever see the face of God? The Scripture says, "Let the same mind be in you that was also in

Christ Jesus." Have you then that gentle, humble, calm, patient, happy, heavenly mind? If not, on what are your hopes built? For if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his; that is, Christ is to him no Saviour; he will die in his sins.

This is a kind of self-examination which should accompany the reading of the word. Here, then, is something for us to do. But supposing that you had found peace with God, and had experienced that blessed change of temper and of nature, without which no man shall see the Lord, this is not the conclusion, but the commencement of your Christian course. Suppose you heard of some wretched captive, who from his infancy had been immured in some dark solitary dungeon, and never had seen the cheerful ways of men, or light of day, and that you were to take off his chains, and throw open his prison doors; and suppose he were to seem unwilling, and to say, "Why, what would you have me to do?" Would not your answer naturally be, "Come out of this miserable dungeon, and you shall see; a new existence will burst upon you; you will see the light, you will walk at liberty, you will converse with your fellow-creatures, and then you will know what you have to do. Duties will call you, enjoyments will invite, which you never dreamed of in the days of your captivity." So it is in the natural bondage of the human soul. If, from that land of Egypt and house of bondage, one asks us, What are all these calls of conscience and ministers about?—what is it that we are to do?—the answer is the same, Come forth and you will see; come out into the light of the Gospel—into the emancipation of God's children, and under the open canopy of eternity. Then cast your eyes around, and you will want no guide; you will see what there is to do; duties to God, for which eternity is not too long—duties to yourself, on which eternity depends—duties to your fellow-creatures, important and interesting beyond all possible calculation.

It is to this latter that my text directs us, "While we have time let us do good unto all men." It is to this that our Lord invites us, when he says, "Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields for they are white already to harvest." Here, it is unnecessary to tell you he was speaking, not of natural things, but of his spiritual vineyard; of the souls which were planted there; those precious vines which he was going to water with his own blood. It was thus that he loved souls; for greater love can no man have than this, that he lay down his life for his friends. It is thus that in proportion as we resemble the blessed Jesus, we shall love souls also; that we, like him, shall go about doing good; to call sinners to repentance; to seek and to save that which was lost. It is an unchangeable law and constitution of our nature, that we cannot desire blessings for others which we do not really desire for ourselves. When we feel the value of our own souls, and not till then, we shall feel the value of the souls around us. When we love God, and not till then, we shall desire that every child of man should love him. It is on this

account that our Lord says to St. Peter, "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Feed my sheep. Feed my lambs." The man awakened to eternal things, feels that the multitude around him are not mere mortal bodies, but immortal spirits. He sees them, as it were, all struggling upon a tempestuous ocean, in danger every moment of going down for ever; and he feels, and he alone can feel, a due anxiety that they may weather the storm, and gain the haven of pure and never-ending blessedness.

It is wonderful with what force this desire of saving our fellow-creatures siezes, like a divine passion, upon the soul. Nor is this blessed work confined to those whose official duties call them outwardly to it. Whoever fears God, rich or poor, male or female, old or young, may, by his life, his counsel, his conversation, be a preacher of righteousness. One instance I will mention, and that of a pious child, the daughter of a person of distinguished rank, bred with that tenderness which might least have prepared her for the rude shocks of strong pain and suffering, with which God was pleased to afflict her. This child was visited by her heavenly Father with a disease which rendered it necessary for her leg to be amputated. When her mother, announced to her, with what agony let us imagine, if we can, that such was the opinion of her surgeons; after some tribute of tears to nature, this early child of grace replied, that her mind was made up; "and who knows," she added, "if I am enabled to bear the operation with patience, whether it may not do some good to the surgeons, to see such a proof of the reality of religion, and of the support which the Lord can give to those who put their trust in him." Here is true charity to the souls of men: here is strength ordained out of the mouth of babes and sucklings: here is the faith and patience of the saints: here is a lesson for young and old, given by a young disciple in the school of Christ. Oh! may we go and do likewise! May many here, of every rank and station, arise and give themselves to this glorious work! May the kingdom of the Redeemer spread among us! In all other hopes we may be deceived: engaged in this blessed employment, we must eventually prevail. We may encounter momentary disappointment; but to promote God's glory and man's happiness, is the cause of heaven, and must be at length triumphant; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it. "Behold the days come," saith the Lord, "that I will raise up unto David a righteous branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name, whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness."

The Apostle's rule upon this subject is, "As we have opportunity, let us do good unto all men," and further than this, our directions cannot go. It is impossible, more particularly in public discourses, to enter into detail: so much depends upon

the nature of men's talents, and the endless variety of their circumstances. But one principle upon this subject I would desire to leave impressed upon your hearts. It is, that the surest and best mode of securing our usefulness to others, is to live to God ourselves. In the first place, this is the best means of obtaining that help from above, without which all our labour and anxieties are vain. Every good and every perfect gift descendeth from the Father of lights. If, then, we would wish to be the instruments of good to our families, our friends, our neighbours, what course so wise as to endeavour to please that all-powerful Being, who can turn the hearts of men as it seemeth best to his godly wisdom. The man who lives to God can pray to him—pray on the behalf of others, as well as his own; and in this way, how much may the effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man produce? When a child of God enters into his closet, and shuts to his door, and prays to his Father which is in secret; at such hallowed moments who can estimate the extent of those blessings which his petitions may draw down: when his supplications pierce the clouds, what showers descend upon the place beneath. As to the world at large, perhaps she owes her sunshine and her rain, her blooming springs and plentiful harvests, to the prayer he makes. With respect to national mercies, also, what is it that shortens the day of visitation upon any people, but the prayers of the elect? Or was it human wisdom, or human power, which has, at sundry times, delivered this country, with so high a hand, out of all her difficulties and dangers? No: it was prayer. It was the supplication of believers, offered up in faith, to a prayer-hearing God. For their sakes alone, is any country saved, or worth saving. For their sakes alone is there peace to Jerusalem; safety within her borders; plenteousness within her palaces, or salvation around her walls. In all the private relations of life, persuaded I am, that in the last great day, many will find that they have owed to the prayer of some relative—so secretly offered up that they knew not of it—that they have owed their share in those eternal blessings which now await them. He, then, that would be a benefactor to others, should himself be a man of prayer.

There is another way in which this principle applies. If we are saved ourselves, we shall be best fitted to benefit and save others. There is a virtue in holiness, in faith, and love, by which the man who eminently possesses, and constantly exhibits them, becomes quick and powerful in acting upon the minds of those around him. There is a meekness in the wisdom which is from above; there is a secret charm in a calm and well-ordered soul, in a quiet and truly humble spirit, which wins upon our hearts, and inclines us to love and to embrace a religion which yields such peaceful fruits. Little as such a man may intend it, his light cannot be hid. It will so shine before men, that they will see his good works, and glorify his Father which is in heaven.

But above all considerations, the man who loves God will love his brother also ; and where love is, there is the image of God, and, in some sense, the power of God also. The man who can feel towards sinners, who can converse with a brother when taken in a fault, as if he pitied his infirmities, and loved his soul, he, and he alone, is furnished for the blessed work of saving the lost, and converting sinners from the error of their ways ; he alone can be a labourer together with God ; for God is love. He alone acts like God : for God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son to save it. He alone imitates the example of Christ : for he loved sinners, and gave himself for them.

In conclusion ; I would not break off this train of thought, so important and so animating to every real Christian, without breathing a fervent aspiration to Heaven, that both I and all of you may be inclined, in the words of my text, as we have opportunity, to do good unto all men. May we seek this best of means for so high an end, even the entire sanctification of our own souls in love : that we may be enabled to offer up prayers which God will hear and answer ; a ceaseless prayer, that we may be made instrumental in saving others, by becoming ourselves partakers of the full Salvation of the Gospel. Happy and enviable state, to dwell in love, and thereby to dwell in God, and God in us ! Happy state, to love God with all our hearts, and to love our neighbours as ourselves ! Happy state, in this life to shed around that blessedness which we feel within ; to comfort those that mourn, and to heal the broken heart ; and when the day of eternity dawns, having turned many to righteousness, to shine forth in those brighter heavens, as the stars, for ever and ever !

H. W.

WHERE IS THE CHURCH?

No. I.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—The above important question occurred to me on reading an article in your February Number signed R. D., in answer to Rev. Thos. Kelly's reply to Rev. Wm. Burgh. I had read Mr. Burgh's pamphlet; Mr. Crosthwaite's on the same side; Mr. Kelly in opposition; lastly, your Correspondent's remarks came before me. I think I have discovered a curious fact, that Mr. C. who says he agrees with Mr. B. really differs from him; and that Mr. K., who writes against Mr. Burgh's view, essentially agrees with him; and further, that your Correspondent agrees, in a great measure, with both.

Mr. Burgh appears to maintain that there is a something in the Church which may be called tradition, mysterious in its nature, important in its effects; which it is dangerous for a Christian community to want, although it is probably considerably different from primitive usages. Mr. Crosthwaite seems of opinion that there is no mystery; that Church authority is simple, like parental authority, or that of a regular government, and that neglect of it is chiefly a breach of order. Mr. Kelly seems to agree with Mr. Burgh, that there is a mysterious, essential something; not tradition, however, but discipline, which is of such absolute necessity, that without it five hundred living members of Christ may be gathered in one place, and engaged in spiritual worship, yet not deserve the name of a Church of Christ, neither be favoured with his promised presence; and at the same moment, a few being gathered in another place, under proper discipline, may be deservedly and scripturally called the Church of Christ, and be favoured with his presence amongst them, though not one of the number has a living faith, has ever known the Lord, or ever shall. In short, so important is discipline, that we may use the Apostle's illustration of the Church in a different way altogether, and say, the members may be gathered when the body is not, and the body be elsewhere, where no member is. With all this, which it seems has startled some persons, your Correspondent seems to say he agrees in principle; only he would propose Diocesan Episcopacy, as that to which we should cleave, though we were quite satisfied there was no one believer amongst those who held it, and great multitudes who rejected it.

If we ask the gentleman where is the Church, or what should we look for, as a mark of the community to which we ought to belong? we shall have the following plain answers, in the order of time in which they have favoured the public with their opinions. Mr. Burgh, tradition; Mr. Kelly, discipline; R. D. Episcopacy.

Now this appears to me very remarkable; and I had to read

what the gentlemen have published over a second time, before I could feel satisfied I was not under some mistake as to what they meant. I observe that the Church of Rome has all these marks; traditions many, very ancient, acted on, and not primitive; but that is no objection, according to Mr. Burgh. Discipline she has, all her members work together in her cause, from her highest dignitary, down to her lowest lay bigot, who shows his zeal in her cause, even when he is drunk, by throwing a stone at his Protestant neighbour. I doubt whether we can say of the best ordered Protestant community, that every member keeps in his own place, and performs constantly its proper part in forwarding the common object. As to acknowledging one another as Christians, that they do exclusively, and this is a main point with Mr. Kelly. I do not suppose your Correspondent, R. D., denies the Episcopacy of the Church of Rome.

As the Church of Rome possesses all these marks of a true Church, so the Church of England disclaims them. Her definition of a Church is simple: a company of faithful men, amongst whom the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments, as ordained of Christ, duly administered. Here is nothing said of what the gentlemen insist on, and some things which they omit, and even disclaim: faith, in the members of the Church, and the due use of the pure Word of God, and of those signs which the Saviour appointed as marks of his visible Church.

I suspect that your Correspondent, and the gentlemen he refers to, have, in their zeal for their favourite points, carried matters a little too far. A true Church of unbelievers seems to me a very odd idea, especially when it is said one ought conscientiously to belong to it. It don't seem to agree with the article, "a company of faithful men;" nor does it seem to agree with the beautiful description of St. Peter, "Ye, also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ.

X.

WHERE IS THE CHURCH?

No. II.

SIR—I observe that a Correspondent in your February Number proposes a new explanation of John xvii. 20—26. I believe that he is under a mistake, and that it arises from a wrong idea, though perhaps a rather common one, of the kind of unity that is promised to the Church. He seems to wish to refer great part of the chapter to a future state of the Church; perhaps only the 24th verse ought to be so explained. I think if we can be sure of any thing in Scripture, it ought to be of the intention of our Lord in the discourse contained in the 14, 15, and 16th chapters, and concluding with his Prayer in the 17th. At least our Lord seems to take uncommon pains to make his

intention very clear. "Let not your heart be troubled," commences the 14th chapter, and recurs in the 27th verse. "I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass, ye might believe." "These things have I spoken unto you that my joy might remain in you." "These things have I spoken unto you that ye should not be offended. These things have I told you that when the time shall come ye may remember," and "These things have I spoken unto you that in me you might have peace. Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." These passages seem to be all explanatory, and to relate to a state of trouble, not to one of glory. Now I do not think we can separate the prayer from this discourse, especially as it contains these passages, "I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil." "They are not of the world. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them." The ideas of an unbelieving world, and a believing Church, preserved by faith, in the midst of it, seems to be continued to the very end of the chapter, and to refer any part of it but the 24th verse to a future state, would seem to destroy the continuity and beauty of this important Scripture.

Your Correspondent's objections to the usual explanation of the passage, seem to prove the same point. He says, the prayer of our Lord for unity in his Church has not, as yet, been answered: I would reply in the words of Scripture, "The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul." It might be said, the agreement did not long continue. I would say, that was because of false brethren, unawares brought in, who came in privily; we should observe that our Lord prays for those who shall believe through the Word. He says, the unity prayed for is that of all believers, to the end. I think if they were believers they must have thought alike. He says the word glory is not applied to the power of working miracles. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus, and manifested forth his glory." He says, the glory mentioned in the 22d verse is the same with that in the 24th; but one is spoken of as past; "I have given," the other as future, "That they may behold my glory." I should think the glory in the 24th verse is the same as that in the 5th.

If we suppose the unity prayed for by our Lord, to be the same recommended by St. Paul, and why should we suppose two different unities in the Church? Then we have a full and instructive description of it. "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace." One body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father. As far as I can understand the Apostle, the unity of the Spirit is a necessary consequence of being in the Lord. It is the bond of peace is to be endeavoured for, or perhaps the outward manifestation of union; and this seems implied in what our Lord prays for, "That the world may know," supposes some external and manifest display of unity: and I think this consideration, if

correct, is fatal to the supposition of your Correspondent, that our Lord only prays for a union in a future and glorified state of the Church; for though we must suppose that the world will know, at the last, who are the Lord's servants, yet their knowledge will not be the consequence of any unity of sentiment in the Church, observed by the world, as would seem to be implied in the 21st verse, and in the 35th verse of the 13th chapter. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another."

Perhaps your Correspondent's objection to the usual explanation of the passage may arise in part, from looking for an union in external matters, and overlooking a very wonderful union in more important things. For example, I have taken the liberty to send you a short paper, in which I have pointed out certain differences about external matters amongst four gentlemen who have published their sentiments. But if the important question were proposed to each of the gentlemen, How is a soul to be saved? I suspect we should find no great difference, if any, amongst them.

There is one objection urged by your Correspondent, that the world has not yet been convinced of the Divine Mission of our Lord; therefore, the prayer is not so to be understood. But our Lord, in the same connection says of the Spirit, "When He is come He will convince the world of sin," &c. We admit that he is come, yet we do not find it needful to maintain that he convinced the whole of mankind.

If the injunction of St. Paul, to endeavour to manifest the unity of the Spirit, be a wholesome one, and if the frequent exhortations of our Lord, to love one another, be in accordance with it, and if the passage in our Saviour's Prayer be a further incentive to it, containing a promise of blessing to many through it, then is your Correspondent's suggested explanation injurious, as far as it may tend to convert a Scripture from an incentive to action, into a matter of speculation.

One thing connected with the subject seems plain, that if there is to be a visible union amongst Christians, which is to be made a blessing to the world, that it will not be promoted by laying hold on external, and allowedly non-essential matters, and magnifying them to an undue importance.

X.

THOUGHTS ON THE PROPRIETY OF CONTINUING IN UNION WITH THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

SIR—Having troubled you with few remarks under the title, "Where is the Church?" it seemed to me that a few others, which suggested themselves whilst writing, might possibly be useful to some of your readers.

I remember having met something like the following remark

in the writings of Ambrose Seale. "While there is in any country, through Divine goodness, so great a blessing as an Establishment for promoting religion and virtue, it is the duty of grace to support it." I could never discover any reasonable objection to the position here laid down. I think if we admit the premises, the conclusion follows, of course. I would catechise myself thus: Do I believe that the Established Church promotes the knowledge of the Gospel of Christ in these kingdoms? Eminently. Do I believe such an Establishment would remain amongst us, if the Providence of God did not uphold it? No; the power and wealth of any state would not be given to the furtherance of the Gospel kingdom, except by an overruling Providence. Is not every Christian community, that furthurs the preaching of the Gospel, equally on the Lord's side? They may have the marks of his grace, but they cannot have equally the marks of his Providence. Supposing that I have received the truth under the ministry of the Established Church, should I then leave her communion, and seek another? Surely not; for then she might be supposed to address me in the words of St. Paul, "Though I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you, for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord." Supposing I were to emigrate in company with a few Christian friends, all of the Established Church, and to find the persons amongst whom we settled, all agreed in one form of sound worship, different from ours, but evidently blessed of the Lord, as many were converted by his Word amongst them; should we conform to their mode of worship, or should we introduce our own amongst them? I should be for conforming to theirs, lest I should be the means of calling off the attention of any man from the internal to the external matters of religion; the chief object of forms of worship being the salvation of the soul.

X.

LECTURES ON SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.*

We consider these volumes as among the most important of the additions that have recently been made to sound theological literature; and therefore, instead of the modern fashionable mode of reviewing—the giving a dissertation on the subject of which the work treats, or, if that, as in the case of the work before us, be impossible—on theology in general, we shall give such an account of the work, and such an analysis of its contents, as will enable our readers to form a correct estimate of its value. We conceive we can scarcely do a more essential service to the interests of religion generally, and of the Established Church in particular, than to commend to the perusal of all, and especially the ministers of the Gospel, such works as this—works which remind us, for extensive research, sound and deep views of divine truth, solid reasoning, sober and judicious criticism, and acute discrimination, of the writers of the bright and palmy days of theological study. The habitual acquaintance with them, next to the Word of God and the throne of grace, will form the best preservative against the crude notions and wild and wanton speculations to which, in the present day, there is such a proneness in many, and which have inflicted, and are inflicting, such deadly mischief upon the cause of true religion.

True it is, Dr. Dick was a Presbyterian, and, in regard to Episcopacy and national establishments, held and taught sentiments at variance with the well-known views of the *CHRISTIAN EXAMINER*; but with these subjects but a few pages of the present work are occupied, and the tone and spirit in which they are discussed are mild and temperate. Indeed, from the manner in which he states the fact, upon the authority of Richard Baxter—a fact, by the way, of which we were not before aware—that some of the most learned and eminent of the divines in the far-famed Westminster Assembly were so decidedly in favour of Primitive Episcopacy, as to obtain the insertion of an explanatory parenthesis in their solemn league and covenant, guarding against its condemnation—we are warranted in believing that Dr. Dick was far from being a bigot to his own system. (See vol. 4, pp. 339, 340.) This opinion of his moderation on such matters as pertained to modes of worship and forms of church government, is, we are assured, fully corroborated by the testimony of those who knew him, and by his invariable public and private conduct. Happy would it have been for the interests of true religion, and so of all her friends, if, at a time when such men as a Gataker

* Lectures on Theology. By the late Rev. John Dick, D.D., Minister of the United Associate Congregation, Greyfriars, Glasgow; and Professor of Theology to the United Secession Church. In 4 vols. 8vo. 1834.

and Burgess, with others among the soundest and most learned of the Nonconformists, were in favour of Primitive Episcopacy, and when even the Westminster Assembly virtually conceded to the views which they held, by levelling their anathema, *not at that*, but at the additions that were the growth of a later age, the views and spirit of our own immortal Ussher had prevailed; and a comprehension taken place which would have banded together all the sound and holy Protestants of the empire, in one compact and devoted phalanx, for the advancement of truth and the extirpation of error. Ireland would then have presented an aspect very different from her present one; and so would England and Scotland too. Instead of the wide-spread desolation which Popery has here created, and the "*war to the knife*" about forms between those who are agreed on all that is fundamental in Christianity on the other side of the Channel, Britain might have presented the lovely spectacle of an enlightened, a harmonious, a holy people, living in unity as brethren. May the spirit of love, and peace, and unity, be yet poured out upon us from on high.

To return from this digression : The volumes before us consist of the Lectures which Dr. Dick delivered to the students of theology, as Professor of Divinity to the United Secession Church of Scotland. Most of our readers are, doubtless, aware that a century ago a secession took place from the Established Church of Scotland; not, be it recollected, on the ground of its being an establishment, (though many of the present members of the Secession are hostile to the very principle of a national establishment of religion,) nor on account of any objection entertained by them to the creeds or forms of worship adopted by that church—for these they retained in their state of secession—but on account of other matters which they considered inconsistent with their Christian and ministerial liberty: particularly patronage, whereby the people were prevented from what these men considered their right of choosing their own pastors, and the depriving ministers of the right of testifying and protesting against what they conceived to be wrong in the decisions of the Ecclesiastical Courts. From this it will appear that dissent in Scotland, at least among the larger bodies of dissidents, is a very different thing from dissent in England. Indeed the original Seceders rejected the term "Dissenters," and acknowledged only that of "Seceders," desiring to be considered as finding fault, not with the constitution of the Church of Scotland, but only what they conceived to be the mal-administration of her courts. Evil communications, however, corrupt good manners; the religious radicalism of the age has crossed the Tweed, and in Scotland, as in England, the cry is heard, regarding the Church, "*Raze, raze it even to the foundations thereof*."

Soon after the commencement of the Secession—which at first consisted of only four, but may now contain, perhaps, four hundred ministers and congregations—while the candidates for the ministry in that body were allowed to attend at the universities

for the study of classics and science, it was deemed necessary that they should study theology under a professor chosen by the body itself. Accordingly, after attending for three sessions at one of the universities, for the study of classics, logic, mathematics, and moral and natural philosophy, upon taking out their degree of Master of Arts, the students undergo an examination before the Presbytery, not only upon these subjects, but also as to their personal religion, soundness in the faith, and their possession of the gifts and qualifications requisite to the efficient discharge of the duties of the ministry. If this is satisfactory, the students enter upon a four year's course of study of theology and biblical literature—attending, for a certain period, the Divinity Hall, where lectures are delivered, examinations held, and certain exercises presented; the remainder of the time being spent in studies under the inspection of the Presbytery. At the termination of this period, upon producing the Professor's certificate, and passing through an examination on the whole course of theology, church history, and biblical literature, they receive license, as it is called, to preach the Gospel.

These volumes contain the Lectures which Dr. Dick delivered to his students while thus attending on the department of study over which he presided; the department of Biblical literature being under the care of his friend and fellow-townsmen, Dr. Mitchell. They embrace the whole range of systematic theology, and comprise a hundred and five lectures, each of which might occupy an hour in the delivery. Three are introductory, on theology and its sources; twelve on the evidences of the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the Scriptures; twelve on the being and attributes of God; six on the Trinity; three on the Divine decrees; then follow, in order, others proportionately on Creation, Angels, Man, Providence, the Fall and its Consequences, the Covenant of Grace, the Mediatorial Offices of Christ, Redemption and its Application, the Privileges of Believers, Good Works, Perseverance, Death and the Resurrection, the Judgment, Heaven and Hell, the Means of Grace, Christian Institutions, the Church and the Law of God.

It would be impossible for us minutely to examine our author's statements and reasonings upon all of these, or, indeed, upon any of them at length. His style throughout is perspicuous, chaste, and manly; and his power of condensing greater than that of almost any author we now recollect. What others would require pages to state, he states in a sentence, and states much better. His views of Divine truth are sound, and his criticisms on the original Scriptures always judicious. In fact, we know of no work that might with more safety be placed in the hands of a candidate for the ministry; and we should like to see it in the library of every minister, especially of our younger brethren. They will seldom need to go elsewhere for weapons with which to defend truth and repel error on the right hand and on the left.

Dr. Dick has been long known to theological readers as the author of the very best treatise extant on the Inspiration of the Scriptures. He seems, from a brief memoir prefixed to these volumes, to have been, in many respects, an extraordinary man. He was a native of Aberdeen. At the age of twelve he was the successful candidate for a bursary in King's College, in that town—a part of the exercise required being to translate two passages, one from a Latin, the other from an English author, into the opposite languages respectively, in a room, alone, and without books. He had finished his college studies before the age of sixteen, when he commenced the study of theology under the well-known Brown, of Haddington; and entered on the work of the ministry at the age of twenty one. The remainder of his life was one of the closest study, even to the end, and of assiduous labour in the Gospel of Christ. To his acquisitions this work bears ample testimony. He was profoundly versed in the original Scriptures, and the critical commentators on them, as well as in the divines who flourished in the age immediately subsequent to the Reformation. Those of the early German schools as well as those who flourished in the Augustan age of theology in our own country, appear to have been his favourites. But, in fact, his reading was almost universal, and every thing was made to contribute to his favourite pursuit.

We had marked a number of passages for insertion, but we prefer giving one of some length, on account of the importance of the subject.

A Mediator is one who intervenes between two parties at variance, and makes peace. The original word is *μεσσης*, which signifies *ἰ μεσσης ὁ εἰς αὐτὸν, qui medius inter duo stat, vel eat.* Unitarians, consistently with their principles, understand it to mean simply a messenger, a person sent by God to declare his will and his promises. But, although it does not admit of a higher sense in its application to Moses, it signifies much more when Christ is designated by it, as will appear, I trust, from what will be said in this lecture, and from the subsequent illustration of his priestly office. The word Mediator does not occur in the Old Testament, except in the translation of the Seventy, who render these words in Job, "Neither is there any day's man (an old word for umpire) betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon both," in the following manner, *Ἐὰν ὃ μεσσης ἦμεν, καὶ ἐλεγχῶν καὶ ἰκανοῦν αὐτὸν ἀποφαιγῶν*, "I wish that we had a mediator attentively hearing and judging between both." The Hebrew *בְּרִיָּה*, is a *judge or arbiter*, employed in settling a dispute, and deciding who has the right side of the question. The passage refers rather to an umpire than a mediator.

"The necessity of the mediation of Christ arises from the existence of sin; which being contrary to the nature and the will of God, renders those who have committed it obnoxious to his displeasure. As they had no means of appeasing his anger, the interposition of another person was requisite to atone for their guilt, and lay the foundation of peace. This

is the great design of his office; but it extends to all the acts, by which sinners are actually brought into a state of reconciliation, are fitted for holding communion with God, and are raised to perfection and immutable felicity in the world to come. It comprehends the particular offices which our Saviour is represented as sustaining, the prophetic, the sacerdotal, and the regal; and it is by executing these that he completely performs the duty, and realises the character of a Mediator. "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." These particular offices will be afterwards considered in their order. In the present lecture I shall confine myself to some general observations. My purpose is to inquire what are the necessary qualifications of a Mediator between God and man, and to show that they are all found in him, to whom this character exclusively belongs.

In the first place, a mediator is necessarily a different person from either of the parties whom it is his design to reconcile; he can neither be the party which is offended, nor the party which has given the offence. The party offended may forgive the offence; but in this case a mediator is not wanted, so far as he is concerned. The party offending may be sorry for his conduct, and earnestly desire that peace may be made; but he may have no access to the party offended, or the latter may reject his advances, because he does not deem the proffered satisfaction to be adequate. In this case, a third person must interpose to adjust the difference, by the proposal of terms in which both will acquiesce.

"It will be said, how could Jesus Christ be a Mediator, since it is certain that he was not in a state of neutrality, but was the party offended, being one with the Father and the Spirit? for, if we hold the common doctrine of the Trinity, which teaches that all the Divine persons subsist in one undivided essence, we must believe that they were all displeased at the sin of man, and that the penalty denounced upon him had the sanction of their common authority. It is acknowledged that, according to this view, he whom we call Mediator must be considered as Lawgiver and Judge, and that, instead of expecting him to interpose in our favour, we had every thing to fear from his vengeance. Have we not reason to believe that it was he who appeared in paradise after the fall, and pronounced the doom of the whole human race upon our guilty progenitors? But let us remember, that the Scriptures introduce us to the knowledge of an economy or arrangement among the persons of the Godhead, by which different characters and offices are assigned to each; and new relations are sustained by them towards one another, and towards us. The law for the violation of which we are condemned, is the law of the Father. He appears in the character of the Supreme Governor of heaven and earth. It is against him that the offence has been committed; it is his justice which demands the punishment of the guilty; and with him remains the power to extend mercy to them, and to prescribe the terms upon which it will be exercised. The Son, having resigned, if I may speak so, these prerogatives to the Father, (resigned them, I mean, for this special purpose,) has assumed a different character. He does not

pursue the claims of justice against sinners, but stands forth as their friend, to rescue them from their perilous situation, and to give such satisfaction as their offended Sovereign may demand. Thus, in this economy, he is distinguished from the Father, and is as closely related to us as the surety is to the person for whom he has become responsible. But, although between him and men an intimate connexion subsists, he is not one of them, considered as offenders; such union would have totally disqualified him for his office. A partaker of their nature, and even of its infirmities, he was perfectly free from that pollution with which it is stained in every other individual. "He was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners,"—so separate that he could approach to God in their name, and was looked upon by the Holy One with entire approbation. This point will afterwards come under our notice.

"In the second place, a mediator must be independent, and master of himself. He must possess full ability for the duties of his office, and a full right to exert that ability in whatever way the design of the office may require. If it be necessary, in order to effect a reconciliation, that he should give satisfaction by sufferings and death, it is evident that he must have absolute power over himself; because those who are subject to the authority of another, cannot dispose of themselves and their services without his consent. Hence we perceive that, in the present case, a mere creature could not have been mediator, because something was required which a creature was not at liberty to give by his own spontaneous deed. Angels and men are the property of the Creator, which cannot be alienated without sacrilege. They must wait his command before they venture to engage in any enterprise not comprehended in the original law of their nature. In particular, it should be considered that the life of man is his gift, and is not to be thrown away or surrendered, whatever good might be anticipated from the sacrifice, without the permission of the Giver. And here we may remark, that the substitution of one life for another, could not be justly admitted by a human government, for this obvious reason, that what the substitute had no right to give away, his superiors could have no right to accept. That the offer was voluntary, would not alter the case, because mere willingness and moral power are two things totally different. As our life is not our own, so our faculties are instruments with which we are furnished for the service of our Maker; and the exertion of them for any purpose not commanded or permitted, is a waste or an abuse, for which we are reprehensible. We may not trifle with our happiness, although it may be thought, that if we choose to suffer we are unwise, but not criminal; for it flows from the Divine bounty, and as it should be thankfully received, so it should be carefully preserved, and only parted with when duty calls, and an act of self-denial is demanded for the glory of God. Into the office of Mediator between God and man, which required the sacrifice of ease and life itself, no mere creature, although otherwise qualified, (which however, was impossible,) could have intruded without presumption. He had not the requisite power, the power to lay down his life, and the power to take it again. But this power belonged to Jesus Christ, who was in-

deed bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, and, if he had possessed no higher nature, would not have been a fit person to mediate between heaven and earth; but, while the Scripture traces his human genealogy, and calls him the Son of David, it is careful to inform us that he was also the Son of God. As a Divine person, he was not under the control of superior power, he was subject to no law, by which his activity was confined to a particular sphere; he might interfere wherever his wisdom and benevolence pointed the way. He could stoop from his dignity, and draw a veil over his glory. Having assumed our nature, he might employ it as the instrument of accomplishing any service which would promote the designs of the Divine government, and the interests of the human race. He might present it as a pure oblation to his Father, and give his blood as the ransom of our souls.

“ In the third place, a mediator must be a person who has great influence over both parties; he must possess the means and the power to terminate their mutual aversion, and unite them in the bonds of peace. It is not the interference of any person which will effect a reconciliation; he must be one who can conduct the business with prudence, and adjust the difference to the satisfaction of both parties. In the present case, the negotiation could be successfully carried on only by one in whom both could confide, and who had such interest with both, that, to use language employed on such occasions among men, they would be disposed to attend to his proposals. The object of the interposition was to bring together, upon amicable terms, God and men, between whom sin had caused a mutual alienation; to remove displeasure on the one hand, and aversion on the other, and to restore an intercourse founded in love. The necessary qualification was found in Jesus Christ; “ Him the Father heareth always;” to his requests he never fails to lend a favourable ear. What would he refuse to a Son, who is the brightness of his glory, and whom he always loved; to a Son, who has shed at the foot of his throne blood more precious, not only than that of bulls and goats, but than the blood of the noblest and the holiest of the human race; a Son, who has so faithfully and honourably finished the work assigned to him, notwithstanding the most formidable difficulties; a Son, who submitted to humiliation, and sorrow, and death, that he might exalt the character of his Father, and give the highest manifestation of his glory to the universe? There was not another in heaven or on earth who had such claims to be heard, when he came forward to intercede for the guilty. To the interest which upon these grounds he possesses with the offended Lawgiver, no limits can be assigned. Infinitely acceptable to Him, both as his own Son, and as our Advocate, he may ask what he will, and it shall be granted to him. God will not retain his anger against those whom one so high in favour has taken under his protection, and recommends to his approbation. His influence with the other party, whose consent is necessary to complete the reconciliation, is equally great. What power is he not able to exert upon them by means of his word, which casts down high thoughts and proud imaginations, and leads captive the willing mind? What can they refuse

to a person of such dignity, who condescends to solicit them? How irresistible are the claims of his blood! How attractive is the display of his grace! If these motives should prove ineffectual to dispel their prejudices, and conquer their aversion, he has access to the springs of motion in the heart. He can send the Holy Spirit to persuade with gentle but irresistible efficacy; who, by a manifestation of wrath and of mercy, of the hopelessness of a contest with the Almighty, and the happiness flowing from his favour, leads them humbly to supplicate peace, and to accept the offered reconciliation with gratitude and joy.

"In the fourth place, a mediator between God and man must be capable of suffering. The design of his office is to make reconciliation; and as God would not pardon sin without satisfaction to his justice, the design could not be accomplished unless the mediator would submit to the penalty; for only upon this condition would the offended Lawgiver receive them into favour. Had the redemption of man been merely an act of power, like the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, the Son of God might have effected it without assuming our nature, and descending to a state of humiliation. But it was a moral work, which was to be conducted in conformity to the principles of the Divine government, and to terminate in a full display of its rectitude and purity. We need not here discuss the question, whether God could have pardoned sin without an atonement. Although we should venture to affirm that he could—and surely it is a venture which ill becomes beings of such limited views—it would be sufficient to know that he would not, as appears from the event; for hence it follows, that the qualification which we are considering, was indispensably necessary to a mediator. The Scriptures, upon the one ground or the other, represent the death of Christ as essential to the plan of our redemption, and ascribe our reconciliation to it: "When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." It is an obvious corollary from these premises, that the Mediator must be a creature, for a creature alone can suffer; the Divine nature is impassible and immortal; its felicity is independent and immutable. But there is probably a great diversity of intelligent beings. We know of two orders, the human and angelical; and it may be asked, whether an individual of either might have assumed this office, or whether there was any reason why he should be exclusively a man? The answer is obvious. The Mediator must be a man, because, being a third person acting between two parties, with a view to reconcile them, he would not have been qualified for his undertaking if he had not possessed the nature of both. But there are two other reasons connected with the necessity of his sufferings. First, if he must undergo the penalty denounced upon the objects of his mission, an angel could not have been our substitute, because he might be annihilated, but could not die in the sense of the law; the death which the law threatened, being the separation of the soul from the body, while his nature is spiritual and uncompounded. Secondly, the expiation of sin must be made in the nature which sinned. The identity of nature seems to have been indispensable to the ends of justice. If a man dies for men, we see a case of righteous

retribution ; but nothing of this kind would have appeared if the burden of human guilt had been laid upon an angel. This doctrine is taught in the following words : " Forasmuch then as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same ; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil ; and deliver them who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." The reason of the incarnation is assigned in the next verse : " For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." The word rendered, by the aid of a supplement, " he took on him the nature," is *εἰσαλαμβάνειν*, from a verb which signifies *to take hold of*, and *to help* : " Verily he did not help angels, but he helped the seed of Abraham," and for this reason he took part of our flesh and blood, and not of the spiritual nature of angels.

" In the fifth place, a Mediator, the design of whose office is to reconcile God to the guilty, must himself be free from sin : " Such an High Priest became us, who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separated from sinners." Would a man, who was himself a rebel, and whose presence would rouse the indignation of his prince, be a proper person to be employed in soliciting the pardon of his brethren in guilt? The perfect purity of the Mediator was necessary to the acceptance of his services. The law made men priests who had infirmity, and needed to offer first for their own sins, and then for the sins of the people ; and the character of the ministers, as well as the nature of the sacrifices, rendered the service unavailing to the expiation of moral guilt. Again, the purity of the Mediator was necessary to the fulfilment of that part of his office which consisted in giving us an example that we might walk worthily of the state of reconciliation ; and that this example might answer its design, it must be absolutely perfect. It must be one which we may implicitly imitate, without doubt and without danger of going astray. Once more, the Mediator between God and man is a source of sanctification, according to the saying of the Evangelist : " Of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." But, how could we derive this blessing from him, if he were not himself perfectly holy? How could we be enlightened by him, if he were not light? When the angel announced his birth to the virgin, he said, " The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee ; therefore that holy thing, which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." This primitive purity he retained during the course of his life, conversing and familiarly associating with sinners, but not learning their ways. He died, indeed, as a criminal, but he died for sins not his own : he " suffered, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." Nay, he was not only free from actual transgression, but he was incapable of sin ; so fortified against temptation, that he could not be seduced. It was an eternal covenant which God intended to establish by his ministry ; a covenant which should not be broken like the first. The first Adam was created in the image of his Maker, but his holiness was not an inalienable possession. Had the second Adam resembled him in mutability, the hopes of mankind might have been disappointed once more ; and the remedy

proving insufficient, the case would have been desperate. But he stood firm in the severest trial. No argument, however subtle, could perplex his reason; no solicitation, however powerful, could seduce his affections. Satan exhausted his arts in vain, and in vain did the world display its glories before him; neither promises nor threatenings, neither flattery nor reproach, could excite a wandering thought, or an irregular desire. The Mediator has, therefore, accomplished the design of his office. By his immaculate sacrifice, the covenant is confirmed, its promises are sure to his spiritual seed, and there is no condemnation to those who believe in him. "Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God!"

"In the last place, a mediator must be a person to whom men may have free access, that they may place confidence in him, and enter without fear into his communion. The design of his office would be defeated, if his character were repulsive, and his conduct were such as to keep them at a distance. They must be encouraged to throw themselves into his arms, to commit themselves to his protection and guidance, to entrust him with their most important concerns. It is by first gaining our confidence, and persuading us to connect ourselves with him, that he brings us back to God from whom we have revolted: "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." That he is one whom we may humbly approach, and in whom we may hope, is evident from these considerations. First, although in one of his natures, he is exalted far above us, and above angels, who, in comparison with him, are less than nothing and vanity; yet on the other, he is nearly related to us, our kinsman and our brother. It is a human voice which gently says, "Fear not, I am he that liveth and was dead." Secondly, he has felt our infirmities, and suffered our affliction, and may we not expect more tender and more active sympathy, than if he had merely a speculative knowledge of our miseries? John refers to the first consideration when he says, 'The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us;' and Paul points out the second as a source of consolation in these words, 'In that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.' Thirdly, we have express assurances that he bears a most tender affection to us. It would be nothing that he is a man like us, nothing, that he has experienced our sorrows, if we had not positive evidence that his love to us is real, constant, and infinite; for men are often hard-hearted to their brethren, and sometimes those who have tasted the evils of adversity appear not to have become more compassionate to others, but to have their feelings blunted and destroyed. But in Jesus Christ we find a heart which responds to the cry of distress, and a tongue which speaks a word in season to the weary. Love displayed in his life and in his death, and unchanged in his state of exaltation, invites sinners to ap-

proach, and assures them of a cordial reception: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life."

"To the duties of his office I have been led frequently to refer when explaining his qualifications. They will be particularly considered when we give an account of the several offices which are implied in the general one of Mediator. As Mediator, he is the representative of God to us, the image of the invisible God, the person in whom he is seen; and the light of the glory of God shines in his face. In consequence of the darkness which sin had spread over the minds of men, and the alienation of heart which it had produced, the knowledge of God was in a great measure lost, but it is restored by the revelation of which he is the Author: 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, that is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' He has not only brought to light those doctrines which reason is supposed able to discover, but he has made known things which eye hath not seen, ear had not heard, neither had it entered into the mind of man to conceive the mysteries of the Divine nature, and the eternal counsels concerning human redemption, which had been hidden from ages and generations. It is owing to the mediation of Christ that such a discovery has been made of the Divine character as is adapted to the present circumstances of man; which, instead of depressing, elevates him, instead of awakening fear, inspires hope and joy. We behold the Father in the face of the Son, and every feature is marked with benignity. The terrors of his majesty have passed away, and we conceive it possible that worms of the dust should hold communion with the Possessor of heaven and earth. The rays of the sun come to us through a cloud, which abates their dazzling splendour, and attempers them to the human eye. To the question of Solomon, 'Will God in very deed dwell with man upon the earth?' we can answer, He will dwell with them; he has sent his beloved Son to reunite them to himself in the bonds of eternal friendship,

"This leads me to remark, that the Mediator has established that peace between God and man which it was the object of his office to effect. For this purpose it was necessary, as I formerly intimated, that the efficacy of his mediation should extend to both parties; that he should reconcile God to men, and men to God. The reconciliation of God to us, by which I mean the appeasing of his anger, and the procuring of our pardon and acceptance, was accomplished by his sacrifice, which, by its intrinsic value, and the willingness with which it was offered, fully satisfied the demands of justice. The reconciliation of sinners to God, which consists in destroying their natural enmity against him, and inspiring love and confidence, is effected by the power of his grace. The consequence is, that God dwells in them, and they dwell in God. Peace on earth, and good will towards men, are the fruits of his mediation: 'This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach

every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sine and their iniquities will I remember no more.'

"From what has been now said, it appears that he is the medium through which intercourse is carried on between heaven and earth. Through him the love of God descends upon us, and through him our prayers, and thanksgiving, and all our holy services ascend to God. He obtains for us all spiritual blessings. They are granted in consideration of his merit, and in answer to his request; and they are not dispensed immediately by the Father, but pass to us through the hands of his Son. The fountain of Divine love has found a channel, in which it flows to refresh and gladden the souls of the guilty and unworthy. The heavens are opened; and peace, and righteousness, and salvation have come down to the habitations of mortals; 'Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them.' In return, we present to him the sacrifices which he requires, of gratitude, praise, and obedience, accompanied with humble supplications for new communications of his goodness. Our services, being imperfect and mingled with sin, might be rejected; but the iniquities of our holy things were expiated by our merciful High Priest, and our oblations presented by him meet with a favourable reception, to which they are not entitled on their own account. His mediation is the basis of all acceptable religion; it gives us boldness to enter into the holiest of all. 'Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.'

"It appears that the duties of the mediatorial office are performed on earth and in heaven, as the high priest of the Jews ministered both in the court, where the altars of sacrifice stood, and in the holy of holies. If it be inquired in what precise nature Jesus Christ is Mediator, I would say that he executes the office in both natures, the Divine and the human. The Scripture characterises him as the man Christ Jesus; but that man was united to the second person of the Trinity. Considered as Mediator on the part of God, he discharges his duty, it has been said, by his Divinity; for it is as God that he sends the Holy Spirit, reigns over the church, reveals the mysteries which none could know but he who is in the bosom of the Father, and performs other acts which imply sovereign authority and infinite power. Considered as Mediator on the part of man, he discharges his duty by his humanity; for it was as man that he died, rose from the grave, and ascended to heaven; as man that he took possession of heavenly glory in our name, and intercedes for us before the throne of his Father. But, in thus referring his mediatorial acts to their respective classes, we ought to be careful to avoid the affectation of accuracy, and not to lose sight of the personal union of his natures, in consequence of which they are one principle of operation in the work of redemption. Since the incarnation, both natures act together according to their peculiar properties. They are not confounded so as to make one nature; but, while they remain distinct, the person is one. Some things could be done only by one of them, as for example, the human nature alone could suffer and die; but

the other is always to be understood as concurring with it. In the death of the human nature, the Divine co-operated, by a voluntary surrender of it to crucifixion, and by communicating such value to its sufferings, that they were an adequate atonement. It is only in the Divine nature that he can hold and exercise the supreme authority over all things, with which he is invested for the salvation of the Church; for it is manifest, that the Lord of heaven and earth must possess infinite knowledge, and wisdom, and power; but his human nature shares in this glory. It is seated at the right hand of God, far above all principalities and powers; and it will be the visible Judge in the great day, when all nations shall be assembled to receive their final sentence: 'When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.' It is in the human nature that he has a fellow feeling of our infirmities, for it was as man that he suffered what we suffer; but his Divine nature goes along with his human in pitying us, and is the source of the consolation by which we are supported."

THE LAW OF ANTI-RELIGIOUS LIBEL.*

Our review of "John Search," in the Number for last March, has done a great evil; it has produced a book, and that not a good one, whether we look at the principles it endeavours to establish, or the confusion and contradiction exhibited in the arguments it employs. It can hardly be considered as a reply to our review, for it scarcely attempts to answer an argument in it: it is rather a second treatise on the same side of the question with "John Search," and inferior to it in almost every respect, with one exception, which we remark with pleasure. It is less offensive to revealed religion. Indeed in more places than one we have read with pleasure, statements to which we shall refer more distinctly in the sequel, which lead us to hope that its author is not only a sincere convert from the errors of Popery, but has tasted, in his soul, of the power and spirit of the Gospel of Christ.

Mr. B. White makes, as many authors do, an apology for writing his book, on the ground of personal duty. He considers his peculiar circumstances impose upon him an obligation to raise his voice against the present state of the law of these countries, with respect to religious libel. Now, with all due respect for Mr. B. White, and his sense of duty, we are of opinion that, of all other men in the three kingdoms, he was the one who was least called upon to write against the law of England, who, if it was bad, and if freeborn Englishmen were raising their voices against it, was, in gratitude, called upon to hold his tongue. What! is a man that has been forced to fly from the persecuting bigotry of his own country, and to take shelter in the British Isles, under the mild protection of her free legislature; who, during the twenty-five years of his expatriation has never had controul laid upon the thought, or the word, or the action, that could dwell in, or come forth from a Christian's heart; is that the man to forget his obligations to British law, and British hospitality; and when a licentious John Search, a spoiled child of free England, cries out for license, not to be a Christian of any denomination he pleases, not to be an infidel himself, this the law grants him without interference, but to be a preacher of infidelity, and public destroyer of religious peace, and hope, and morality, is this man to fancy that it is his duty to hark in with John Search? Surely it would have become the sheltered Blanco White to have held his tongue.

* The Law of Anti-Religious Libel Reconsidered, in a Letter to the Editor of the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, in Answer to an Article of that Periodical against a Pamphlet, entitled "Considerations," &c. by John Search. By the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, M.A. of Oriel College, Oxford.—Dublin: Richard Milliken and Son, Booksellers to the University; B. Fellowes, Ludgate-street, London, 1834.

Surely if he had taken a just view of his situation with regard to Britain, he would have put his hand into the fire before, in regard to the land that has sheltered him, he would have written on the margin of the first page of his book, "The persecuting principle, irritating to the author's mind." Is it after twenty-five years peaceful protection, that he is to turn round to her and tell her that her persecuting spirit irritates his mind? She might well ask him, why did you choose my shores as your refuge? Why did you not pass on to lands of purer liberty, as you would call them, where thousands and tens of thousands profess infidelity, and in open day blaspheme the God that made them, and the Saviour that died to save them? You should have known that such liberty neither suits the taste of the people, nor the genius of the laws of England.

But this book has come out, and it is now our part to state our sentiments concerning it; and that we may dispose of the little in it which refers to our former review, we would remind our readers that we accused John Search's book of Deism in religion, and sophism in argument. The principal sophism in argument consisted in the intentional confusion the author made between the foundation of the law, and the enactments of the law. Mr. B. White attempts no defence of John Search, on this point; of course admitting, (as indeed he could not well help) the charge. As to our charge of Deism in religion, and making a distinction between natural and revealed religion, wherein he speaks of revealed religion, as from its uncertainty, less entitled to respect and protection than natural religion. Blanco White denies the fact—he says:

"I do not agree with the reviewer as to the fact that John Search expresses himself favourably to any limitation of the freedom of discussion."

To confirm this he subjoins a note, which we quote, that he may have the advantage of the argument in his own words:

"It appears clear to me that what John Search says *incidentally* respecting the principles of natural religion, is directly connected with the word *harsh*, which he had applied to the existing law. 'That the religious inquirer (he says) who—without a thought or feeling of irreverence to God or religion, as such, or a single word of intentional insult to the institutions of his country—seeks, only by fair investigation, to try 'the certainty of the things wherein he has been instructed,' should hereby be subjected to penalties thus severe—does seem harsh, be his conclusions never so faulty: (and even of *that*, who is to be the *arbiter*?)—it does seem harsh to make him liable to penalties thus severe and thus infamous, for submitting to public judgment the grounds of his own distrust of certain human statements and human testimony, on subjects confessedly of the nearest import to himself and all mankind: for alleging, in the way of argument, that he has just grounds for doubt—not of the existence, not of the goodness, the wisdom, the mercy, or the overruling providence of God, nor the

obligation of human duties, and future responsibility of man.' . . . A candid reader will easily perceive that the author does not *grant* that it would be *just* to punish for such doubts, but that it would be *less revolting*. And the reason is clear, since the shock which such doubts would produce, the *fear of practical evil consequences*, which is generally at the bottom of religious intolerance, would make the error of punishing more excusable. John Search himself shows that this must have been his meaning, by the words which immediately follow. 'To state the nature of this offence (the offence punishable by the present law) quite plainly, and not to outstep the *sympathies* of his bearer, is not always within the skill of the lawyer'—p. 4 and 5. I have put *sympathies* in italics, as being the word which explains the true meaning of the passage."

Mr. B. White asserts, that John Search only means to say, it would be harsher to punish the man who writes against revealed religion, if he does not write against natural religion; but surely this is advancing, only in a different way, the same thing against which we raise our voice. It would not be harsher, or more cruel to punish a man for writing against revealed religion, than against natural religion, except that there is something less sacred, less certain, less worthy of reverence in revealed religion than in natural.

But though this is the only place in "John Search" which Mr. B. White has noticed, it is not the only place to which our review has pointed, which marks the author's distinction between natural and revealed religion. All his arguments apply to revealed religion: the "*human testimony*," the "*human statements*," all belong to revealed religion. When he says, "the truth of Scripture is matter of opinion."

"In the case of the Gospel facts, the solemn denial of their truth by the major half of the Jewish nation, in the first instance, and by their posterity ever since, forms a body of counter-testimony, which cannot, by any commonly candid reasoner be deemed entirely without weight, and must at least, effectually make an opening for honest diversity of opinion."

All this, and much more, applies to revealed religion, and not to natural religion; and therefore John Search's book is against preventing attacks upon revealed religion, but not upon natural religion. So we must avail ourselves of Mr. B. White's admission, that in so doing John Search has ruined his own argument. Whilst he has endeavoured to show that restraint has been carried too far, when made to extend to revealed religion; he has admitted the principle of restraint, by the difference he has laid down between the two; and further, by not having in his whole book advanced one argument to show why a man should not be restrained from writing and publishing against the "existence, goodness, wisdom, mercy, or over-ruling Providence of God, or against the obligation of human duties, and future responsibility of man."

But further, Mr. B. White's book is an admission that we have on this ground, proved the ruin of John Search's argument, by, his, however shyly, allowing restraint in the matter of natural religion, whilst he abjures restraint in the case of revealed religion. We say B. White's book is an admission of this, for it is written to supply his deficiency, and boldly to advocate what John Search did not venture to advocate, viz: the impropriety of restraining men from publishing their denial of the existence, goodness, wisdom, mercy, and over-ruling Providence of God.

The object of Mr. B. White's book is, to plead for every man's right, in a Christian country, to blaspheme with impunity God and Jesus Christ; to treat the idea of a God as if it was a child's fable, and the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ as if it was an imposture, and the Son of God the impostor.—We must give his own words:

"I feel bound to declare, that my objection to limitation of the freedom of discussion and decision, on religious subjects, extends beyond the limits which the reviewer supposes to have been set by that able writer. It is, indeed, my fixed principle, that on subjects where the final object is TRUTH, every man has an unlimited right to oppose, in argument, whatever any other man has a right to prove by argument. Within the terms in which I have expressed myself—i. e. when the question is Truth—I make no exception whatever. And I maintain that any law, which limits the rights of argumentation and conclusion, proceeds from the same persecuting principle, which, in Spain and Turkey, drags to the scaffold any person who declares the established religion of those countries, respectively, to be not of Divine origin.

And again:

"The true question is this, has any man, or set of men, a right to prescribe to others what propositions they must never attack as erroneous? The defender of the existing laws on religious libel is bound to show, both who those privileged beings are, and to demonstrate their titles in the most satisfactory manner. Until he has done this, the equal rights of explicit judgment and discussion must be considered inalienable in every one to whom God has given the power of thinking and expressing his thoughts."

We almost start in astonishment that the Rev. B. White could write through this sentence. God, he admits, has given man the power of thinking, and expressing his thoughts; and so, he argues, he has conferred on him an inalienable right of denying the existence, goodness, and Providence of that God. Strange, that the same pen which rightly ascribes to God the gift of reason and speech, should contend that that very gift confers on man a right to blaspheme God, and to deny his existence, power, and goodness.

As to his question, which he seems to put forward as if it was unanswerable, Has any man or set of men a right to pre-

scribe to others what propositions they must never attack as erroneous? We think it very easily answered. We say, the man, or set of men, to whom God in his Providence has given authority to rule in his name, have not a right (for we speak not of the rights of men) but are bound by their duty to that God by whom kings reign and princes execute justice, to prescribe to their subjects not to deny the existence, &c. of the God from whom they acknowledge their authority to be derived. They are bound to provide that this proposition "THERE IS A GOD," shall not be attacked as erroneous, on three grounds, not to mention more.

1st. Out of reverence to God.

2d. For the maintenance of their authority, which, as it springs from God, must be shaken when that proposition is attacked.

3d. To preserve their subjects from the sin of Atheism, and all its evil consequences.

The existence of this duty, on the part of governors, will appear evident, when we settle, by Scripture, this question put by our Lord, with regard to the baptism of John. Is it from heaven, or of men?

If it was decided that government was of men, and as is a fashionable popular sentiment in these days, the people are the source of all power, still it would not follow that it was not the duty of a people recognizing the existence of a God, and that it was not their interest to commit to their governors a right to restrain men from blaspheming that God in whom they, as a body, believe. On this supposition, from which, however, we dissent in toto, the right and the duty, we think, could be defended and maintained. But if God be the source of legitimate human authority, then those exercising that authority, and acknowledging the source from whence they derive it, without question are bound by the honor they owe to God, and by the obligation they are under, to uphold the authority committed to them, to admit no denial of the source from whence that authority is derived.

We are well aware that persons tinctured with the scepticism of which we have been led to accuse John Search, will deny the Divine origin of human authority: and that all his theory of the absence of all restraint, even as to the denial of a God, flows out of his excluding God from human government. We could not, in such a paper as this, enter at length into the subject; we could not go the full length required, to show the inconsistency of such a theory with the moral government of God, or its contradiction of the plain language of Scripture. But as we do believe human government to be of God, and that upon that ground alone, if there was no other, human governors are bound in duty, to restrain the denial of the existence of a God, we would briefly refer to a few places in Scripture, which appear to us to decide the matter with those who will bow to the word of

God. We would not adduce any texts connected with the kingdom of Israel, not because we do not think them applicable, but because many persons, though we think groundlessly, consider the kingdom of Israel, and God's dealings with them, so peculiar, as not to furnish instruction as to other kingdoms. We would show that heathen kings, though they knew not God, yet did derive their authority from the one God, even our own God. We would refer to the language of Daniel to Nebuchadnezzar, "Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory."—Dan. ii. 37. And afterwards he was to be driven from among men, &c. "Until thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will."—Dan. iv. 32. and Dan. v. 18. "The most high God gave Nebuchadnezzar, thy father, a kingdom, and majesty, and glory, and honour." "Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah."

This authority of God, existed over the heathen kingdoms, and it is recognized and enforced by the Christian dispensation, as we find, Rom. 13. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. For he is the minister of God to thee for good. Wherefore, ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake, for this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." Now, if rulers are God's ministers, unless they are false to their trust, and deficient in their duty, unless they will give up their own authority, they must maintain the existence and authority of God.

Again, St. Peter says, 1 Pet. ii. 13, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king, as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him, for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." Now if governors recognise this plain word of Scripture, if they exercise authority as those that are sent of God, for the punishment of evil doers, can they hold their station, and be faithful to the God that sent them, whilst they allow those over whom he hath placed them, to deny the very existence of a God. Could an officer who held his commission from his king maintain and exercise his authority, if he allowed those under him to deny the existence and authority of any person as his king and their king, deny that there was a king, or that the person from whom he received his commission was king? So, a Christian governor ought to feel that he is God's minister—that he receives the kingdom from him. Every governor ought to be a Christian governor, therefore, he ought to feel that he is God's minister, and therefore he ought to

restrain any subject from denying the existence and authority of God, inasmuch as from God his own authority is derived.

We are not surprised that an infidel, who denies in his heart the existence of a God, who further denies that the powers that be are ordained of God; who denies that the ruler is the minister of God; that he should deny, likewise, that that ruler has a right to restrain him in expressing his denial of the existence and authority of God. But we are surprised that a believer, a Christian, as Mr. B. White professes himself to be (and we trust sincerely) should believe, as he must, upon the authority of God's word, that the ruler is God's minister, and is ordained of God, and yet think that as God's servant, he not only is not bound, but has not a right to restrain his subject from expressing his denial of the existence of a God.

We strongly suspect that John Search would wish to have government considered as a thing purely human, both in its origin, and in its object; and we are sorry to observe that prejudices, arising perhaps from his peculiar lot in life, and his peculiar position, have produced a tendency of this kind on the mind of Mr. B. White.

But even upon this incorrect, because unscriptural, view of the origin and nature of government, we do not see that it follows that there should be no restraint upon the expression of opinions.

Was the authority of government not "of heaven, but of men," was the quantum and character of their power vested by the will of man, in those placed by them in the situation of rule, still we cannot see that if those men who appointed and limited their governors were prudent, and knew their own interests, and above all, if they were godly, and had a respect for the character of God, we cannot see that they would not commit to them a power of restraining every expression of sentiment which struck at the very root of all religion. We would ask B. White, as a Christian man, would he be voluntarily a member of any society in which there should be avowed license to every infidel to proclaim his infidelity; and to every profligate scoffer to outrage Christian feeling by a public blasphemy of that name which he adores and loves? We shall not ask what discipline he would think it his duty to exercise in this respect, as the father of a family, as he seems to have such a dislike to compare a nation to a family; but we would ask him, would he consider that he was taking that care of his growing sons and daughters which affection would lead him to take, if he exposed them to have their faith shaken, and their principles undermined by every libertine sceptic that chose to attack all that was sacred and pure? Would he think that he was unwarrantably interfering with the rights of men, if he insisted, as one of the terms of mutual society, that there should be at least silence on that offensive subject? And could he, as a Christian man, help rejecting all further intercourse, if his overtures for silence were

rejected in language like that which he himself has used, p. 78 of his book :

"The same vehement aversion to external acquiescences in what I believed to be false, which made me quit the country where I was born, would still carry me away from that which has adopted me, if, disbelieving Christianity, the law (or any thing else) prevented me from saying so."

Would he consent to be a member of a society with a man or many men, who thus pleaded their determination and right to impugn the very foundations of natural and revealed religion? And if, as a Christian, he could not be a member of such a society, and admit such an unrestrained expression of opinion, how can he, as a Christian, desire that a freedom from restraint, which he could not tolerate in a voluntary private society, should be permitted in the larger society of a nation?

But we have dwelt, perhaps, too long upon the question which is at issue between us: and have wandered too far away from the book, which we did not take up to answer but to review. We return, therefore, to our author. He has employed himself in many pages with Bishop Warburton, with whose speculations we really have nothing to do. We think John Search, and Co. very proper persons to knock their heads against Bishop Warburton, and we shall not interfere between them. We shall not undertake to decide which are most paradoxical, fanciful and erroneous.

Our author feels that he would have a very insufficient field for his remarks, and his declamation, if he confined himself to the question in hand, that is, the propriety or impropriety of restraining the public expression of sentiments against the existence, &c. of a God, or against the truth of Christianity, as a whole: and he sets himself to confound this simple idea with that of upholding by law certain systems of religion, and enforcing, under penalties, conformity to such religious systems. We shall give a quotation rather longer than we could wish; but with some authors it is hard to find their sentiments in a small compass:

"We hear very plausible speeches in commendation of the parental rights and duties of the supreme magistrate. 'Why should he (it is said) not watch over his people, as a father over his household, seeing that the demoralizing poison of false opinions may dissolve the body of the nation?'—And yet not a king is allowed to ascend the throne without renouncing for ever his own judgment on religious matters, and blinding himself with the most solemn oaths, to hold the tenets of a certain portion of his subjects.—Can there be a clearer proof, that under the name of the Sovereign, of his parental care, and his conscientious judgment, the defenders of intolerance mean themselves? Let us proceed. 'The law (it is said) should protect Christianity, because Christianity is part and parcel of the law.'—But is the law any thing but the express will of the legislature? Suppose the legis-

lature should change its collective opinion, would you tolerate a new law, declaring that as religion is essentially *personal*, and as a *nation*, collectively, has neither a *conscience*, nor a *soul to be saved*, so it cannot have a religion:—that the majority of individuals in this kingdom profess Christianity, *de facto*, but that the *kingdom* (an imaginary being, a creation of the mind,) is neither Christian, nor Mahometan, nor Unbeliever. Suppose that this conceivable act declared, that though, at present, it was not intended to appropriate the wealth which had hitherto been employed in supporting Christianity, to the teachers of any other religion, Parliament wished solemnly to declare their right to bestow that wealth on whosoever they pleased, and to promote whatever religion might seem to them best adapted to support the political system. Stop, (I hear the opponents say) Thanks to heaven, the members of both houses of parliament, and especially the king, are still under the obligation of oaths which would make such a law an act of perjury?"—So, then, that supreme authority of the nation has also been deprived of freedom of judgment upon these matters? The will of a Parliament, long long numbered with the dead, because it happens to be the will of a certain number and succession of individuals, is the *law*, and must be the law for ever!—What then becomes of all the rights of governors, all their parental wisdom, all their inalienable authority to judge which opinions help, and which impede the operation of the laws they have to enact? Are not all these things deceitful shapes under which the *will*, and the *judgment*, and the *opinions* of a certain number of individuals disguise themselves? Is not *Self*, the *self* of every one to whom the present law affords a superiority over others—is not that *SELF* the real and only source of all the theories which bestow on civil governments the right of persecuting for opinions?"

Now we would ask, what has all this to say to the question of restraining men from expressing their denial of the existence of a God, or of the truths of Christianity as a whole. This might all be to the point, if he was writing against the law as it is in Spain; but it is all *fudge*, as respects the law of libel in religious matters in these countries. This declamation might be as pertinent, as it affects to be feeling, if the state of the law that roused such keen sensibility was, that it attempts, as in Roman Catholic countries, to force all men to a unity of sentiment on the details of Christianity, but it is really quite foreign to the purpose, when the state of the law is, that it allows every man to maintain, profess, and exercise any form of religion he pleases, but only restrains the infidel from a public expression of his infidelity.

Mr. B. White, after having given us a lecture upon what he declares to be a very "useful distinction, which is rather neglected by logicians among us, 'that of objective and subjective truth,' after having told us that 'that is truth for us, which each of us is persuaded to be true,' and then again having said that he does 'not mean to assert that all convictions upon religious subjects are equally right.' He adds, 'what I assert is, that

whatever moral duties man owes to truth, he owes to the subjective truth, which, after proper examination, he has found. *Veracity* demands his avowal of it. His denial of it is a criminal falsehood.' Then he breaks out into an indignant exclamation against its being said to him, that all that the law requires is silence:

"An evasion is frequently resorted to at this point of the argument, which I can scarcely divest in my mind from the character of an insult. It is said that what the law of England demands is only *silence*. The law allows perfect freedom to *opinions*, provided they are not expressed. A noble gift! The law of England allows that which no human power can prevent!"

John Search expresses the same indignation at its being said, that he may have his opinion, but he must be silent, and keep it to himself. How this may suit John Search, who, never having been subject to the tender mercies of a Spanish Priesthood, cries out at the very idea of the slightest restraint: but for B. White, who knows the difference, who knows what real persecution is, to tell us that it is an insult to him to tell him he may think what he pleases, but he must hold his tongue if he is an infidel, and not publicly express his denial of the existence of a God!! He says no human power can prevent the freedom of opinion. He tells us in the early part of his volume that he is growing old and feeble, and we know one of the faculties that most generally fails in old age is memory; he, therefore, forgets how they found out a way in Spain, to prevent freedom of opinion. We shall remind him, (and we are very glad that he escaped having the thing practised upon him :) Only by putting the man with wrong opinions into the dungeons of the Inquisition, and then burning him and his opinions. No human power can prevent freedom of opinion, says Rev. J. B. White, when sitting in his easy chair, at Redesdale, near Dublin. Come over to us, say the Inquisitors in Spain, and we shall soon put you into a situation in which you will not consider it an insult if we say to you, think what you please, but only be silent.

A few lines further down we find this sentence:

"Unless there is a supreme judge of *truth* among men, the act of depriving any man of the natural means (argument) of defending his own *truth*, is the worst and most intolerable kind of tyranny."

Now what is it which B. White calls here by the name of *truth*, which it is such tyranny not to allow him to defend? What does he here speak of as in any way deserving the name of truth? *that there is no God!!*

We would warn Mr. B. White against the expression of such sentiments as these, calculated to infuse into the minds of his readers that there is nothing certain, nothing solid in religious truth; that the first fundamental principle of all religion is a de-

bateable proposition which some may believe, and others, with equally good reason, disbelieve, and equally good argument impugn.

There are many other passages in his book of the same tendency; and if they stood there unredeemed, they would lead his readers to suppose that he was himself sceptical, and believed that "*there is no God*" was as much a truth as that "*there is a God*."

It is with much real pleasure we make the following long quotation, which shows that our author is not only a believer in the truths of the Gospel, but that he is acquainted with the source from which Divine knowledge comes into the corrupt, wicked, prejudiced heart of fallen man. There is something in the language, at times, which is not quite to our taste, but, upon the whole, it proves that our author knows that no man can say that Jesus is the Christ, but by the Holy Ghost; but that, on the other hand, he that hath the unction of the Holy One "knows that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true, and that we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ." 1 John, v. 20.

"Christianity is a *living principle* which its Founder has promised to those who will receive him as the Messiah, the Son of God, their spiritual King and Teacher, and thus believing, will accept the promise of this principle, which is called both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ. This principle is *supernatural*, though it does not show itself (as it did when first imparted on the day of Pentecost, and some time after) in supernatural operations. It is a supernatural and divine power, which more or less rapidly raises the natural mind of the Christian to a state of moral holiness; which more or less gradually subdues the sinful propensities, and increases the aspirations of the immortal soul after the Eternal Source of its being, through love of *Him* in whom "*dwelleth the Godhead bodily*,"—of *Him* "*who loved us and gave himself for us*. Of the manner in which this divine "*power unto salvation*" is imparted, and why it seems to court admission into some souls, while it appears as if there existed a repulsion between it and the hearts of others—the writings of the New Testament say nothing that we can reduce to a clear and definite statement. Neither revelation nor philosophy will ever be able to penetrate into the dark abyss which encircles the human mind at a short distance from the glimmering light by which it has to guide itself into eternity. Every speculation, both theological and philosophical, leads finally to that darkness where all events connected with ourselves take the shape (a false shape, I firmly believe) of immoveable *Fate*. The reasoning faculties of man meet with nothing else (however language may endeavour to disguise it), whether it follows Augustine through his system of Grace and Free-will—whether it takes Arminius for its guide, or goes back to Zeno and the Stoics, or to Plato and the Academy. With respect to the *evidence*, which alone is capable of making true Christians, we know that "*no man comes to Christ unless the Father draws him*." We are told by Paul, that "*no man can say that Jesus is the*

Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.”* We are assured that the divine seed will be productive only in the “good ground.” Christianity will not appear true to any one who has not previously some point of contact, some analogous principle bestowed on his heart by God. To perceive the divinity which dwells in Christ, and to acknowledge it from that conviction which the New Testament call saving faith, there must be already a faculty, however dormant, in the human moral being—a *spiritual taste* (if I may venture on so bold a metaphor) to which the internal evidence of the Gospel may address itself. Where this faculty has been implanted (for I acknowledge that it is not *natural* to man), the process of conviction which produces true faith will, under a great variety of minor circumstances, be always reducible to this which I am about to state. The person of Christ, or rather the Spirit and character, and power of Christ, as they appear in the New Testament, will be presented to the mind. Collateral arguments and proofs, according to the capacity and circumstances of the hearer, may assist in removing obscurities and doubts. But it will be the moral perception of Christ’s divinity that will sooner or later draw out the heartfelt confession—“I believe that thou art the Christ the Son of the living God.” Much more indeed may, and will, grow out of this first seed of divine life. Moral fruits will certainly follow in all cases; the pregnant truth thus originally accepted will probably develop itself into a greater or less comprehension of the relations which the great facts of the mystery of redemption bear to us. But whatever may be the extent or limitation of this knowledge—nay, even in spite of positive errors of speculation, the faith which I have described—the acceptance of Christ as a Saviour, and the lively trust in his promises of spiritual power to overcome sin in this life, and of eternal happiness in the next, are secured. The consciousness of this state, which each individual may have, constitutes the highest degree of certainty which the subject admits. This consciousness may produce more or less *assurance*, for assurance is a mere feeling, subject to a variety of extraneous influences. But the least degree of hope which true faith can give is above every possible degree which ARGUMENT can produce on such matters. The Apostle John positively tells all true Christians, without distinction, that they have in themselves the *true witness*; and I believe the same thing of Christians of all ages past, present and future. I shall only add, that this *witness* is valid in regard to the hopes of each individual; but he must not force his testimony upon others.”

For this passage, which not only declares Christianity to be a divine revelation proclaimed externally in his word, but a divine revelation communicated inwardly by divine influence to the heart of man, by which divine influence the believer has a witness within himself of its truth, and can *know* it to be true—for this passage we thank our author, and are disposed to forgive and forget every thing he has said against us, and against the truth which we love. But we must point out the fallacy contained in his subsequent remarks.

“As it appears to me that your Reviewer is too much of a true Christian to question the substance of the above statement, I must fear that the activity

of that bitter root of persecution which lurks, unknown to him, in his heart, must be great, since it can betray him into the strange assertions which he ventures upon the external evidence of Christianity. His "amusement," "his pain," his "grief," come again upon him, when he finds the following words in *John Search*:

"At all events—with respect to the law of the case—if assurance in this matter can never amount strictly to *knowledge*, is it just to punish a man for professing disbelief of that which no man can *know* to be true?"

Now we must protest against what is here imputed to us—"strange assertions which we ventured upon the external evidences of Christianity." We never uttered one word upon the external evidences of Christianity, as distinguished from the internal evidences or spiritual influences by which men are brought to believe and to know that the Son of God is come. John Search, with whom we had to do, made no such distinction. When he said that no man could know Christianity to be true, he did not say "*by its external evidences.*" His argument would have been defeated by such an exception. His argument, if it could be called argument, required him to say, that there was no way, *absolutely no way*, by which a man could *know* Christianity to be true, and therefore it was harsh to punish him for under such circumstances expressing his doubts. But we are glad that we have Mr. B. White's testimony, that a man can know Christianity to be true; and, therefore, when governors, who do know it to be true, make a law to punish any man who *publishes* his disbelief of it, they do not commit the injustice of punishing a man for professing disbelief of that which no man can *know* to be true, but for professing disbelief of that which they know, and which the opposers could know, to be true, if they were under the enlightening and sanctifying influence of God's Spirit, instead of being under the darkening and debasing influence of the fallen spirit of the world. If men's minds, before they were addressed by the offer of the Gospel, were equally disposed to good or evil, truth or untruth, we do believe that the evidences of the Gospel are sufficient to convince every man who weighs them; and when a man rejects the evidences of the Gospel, it is not on account of want of a convincing power in them, but of want of willingness in him to receive them; and this is what we mean when we *deny* to those to whom the Gospel is addressed *honest doubt*. We mean to say that the fault lies in the man, and not in the evidences of the Gospel. Against such an accusation, Mr. B. White, on the part of all unbelievers, is quite indignant. He says, "To question the possibility of such an honest doubt is a most unfair assumption." And then, after an impassioned tirade against our positiveness and violence—"our disregard of all modifications of character"—"our ignorance of the infinite number of circumstances which alter and vary the standard by which the human mind judges of probabilities," and a great deal more of such rant, he proceeds:

"With respect to the *honesty* which is so sweepingly denied to unbelievers, I can state, from the unquestionable knowledge which I have of myself, that I, for one, disbelieved *honestly*, that is, without any bad motive. I have been now a believer for many years upon conviction, after a long and laborious search. I am convinced that in *disbelieving* I was wrong—I mean *mistaken*; but of *dishonesty* I never was conscious. What degree of moral guilt might be connected with my former state of judgment, God alone knows. This, however, I positively know, that in my *unbelief*, my love of TRUTH possessed my whole soul. These are facts which no theory can invalidate. I may add (and ought to add, in justice to many of my friends) that I have known unbelievers most intimately. Among them I recollect men who could not be surpassed in their love of truth and honesty. But I never knew an unbeliever who was *dishonest* in his unbelief. *Belief* may be counterfeited, and there are many temptations all over the world to affect it; but to pretend *unbelief* which does not exist—to deny proofs that are really felt to be convincing—is a moral and mental phenomenon with which I have not met within the range of my experience."

Now we must beg leave to say we are not convinced by our reverend author. He has not convinced us of the honesty of unbelievers taken as a class. We are not quite sure that he is a perfectly unbiassed judge in his own case. There is one very important branch of religious truth of which we doubt that Mr. B. White is fully persuaded, and that is the deep corruption of human nature. In spite of all he says of his own honesty (though we do not, for a moment, impeach his veracity), yet we think it very possible that there was more of a moral obliquity than he is aware of. We cannot forget that the Scripture has said, "*The heart of man is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; who can know it;*" and David cried out, "Who can understand his errors?" So our author may not have detected the dishonesty of his own heart. We are the more inclined to suspect him of this want of knowledge of the deep and total corruption of the heart, from his desire, not only to ascribe honesty to himself, but to all the unbelievers with whom he was acquainted. Now we cannot pretend to speak of those individuals to whom he alludes, but we must think it very improbable that they were different from, and purer than, any other class of unbelievers. In spite of all our author says of the extenuating circumstances belonging to the unbelievers in our Lord's time, He says of them (as Mr. B. White admits in a note) that "they loved the darkness better than the light because their deeds were evil." He expostulates with them, "How can ye believe that receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only." To others—"If ye were blind ye should have no sin; but now ye say, we see; therefore your sin remaineth." Were these honest unbelievers? and what reason have we to think unbelievers of the present day more honest? Surely the heart of man is the same corrupt, dishonest, deceitful thing now it was then. In David's time the unbelievers were not those honest virtuous men that

Mr. B. White thinks he has found them. "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God. They are corrupt; they have done abominable works." And we cannot but quote the awful words of the Apostle Paul: "If our Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost, in whom the God of this world hath blinded the eyes of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine on them."

There appears to us to be a want of a due acknowledgement of the great but humbling truth of man's corrupt and fallen nature, inclined to evil and averse from truth, in those who are crying out for unrestrained liberty to the infidel and the sceptic to publish their false and pestilential thoughts. Those who advocate this liberty, if they do not wish for the spread of infidelity, and all its consequential vice and immorality, must shut their eyes to the fact that fallen man has a predisposition to receive the falsehood rather than the truth.* The heart is prepared to receive the deadly infection, and all man's love of sin and distaste for holy restraint throws open a ready door for the entrance of such doctrines. We would then, in spite of John Search, who would allow publications against Christianity, if there was no denial of the existence, goodness, &c. of God—in spite of Mr. B. White, who would permit even blasphemy against the very idea of a God—we would have governors restrain infidel publications, on account of the honour they owe to God, whose name the infidel blasphemes—on account of the protection they should give to the authority of their office, which is derived from God; and lastly, for the good of the society which they govern, that it may not be infected with a deadly poison. But we would go no further than the case requires; we would only enforce, as the law of England does, silence; we would only insist that the infidel shall keep the poison to himself. We feel it necessary to make this plain

* John Search says (p. 50), "The only perfectly good plan, fair in itself and consistent with the true honour of revealed religion, would be to tolerate an unlimited discussion of the grounds whereon we receive it; to lay its evidences fully open to the investigation of friends or adversaries, without reservation as to style or manner, or any farther check in that matter than such as would most effectually arise from the censorship of public judgment, from the scorn and indignation of mankind, against him who, on such a subject, should dare pervert the liberty given him to the purposes of contumely or abuse." Now, could the man that wrote this assent to the Scriptural estimate of man's moral character, that the whole world lieth in wickedness. If he thought the multitude were evil, could he set up the censorship of public judgment as that which would sufficiently secure morality. If he believed mankind universally to be averse from good, and inclined to evil, could he calculate upon their scorn and indignation being directed against him "who should pervert the liberty given him?" The man who writes this has yet to learn that the whole human race are far gone from original righteousness.

declaration, though the whole tenor of our remarks all go to this one point, because our author, throughout his book, is continually confounding the restraint of publication against the foundations of all religion, with an attempt to coerce men into an uniformity in the several particulars of worship and doctrine. Three-fourths of his declamation against intolerance and persecution have no meaning, unless directed against such bigotry as will enforce unity by penal enactments. Sometimes, indeed, we find him descending into what is like disingenuousness, through means of this confusion, between a restraint of publication and a coercion of conformity. For example:

"If the rights of every individual conscience to declare its OWN TRUTH, i. e. its own conviction, are denied, the Christian who openly refused to burn a handful of incense before the images of the emperors were public offenders, and deserved their fate. For the Roman law did not (as some say of the existing law of libel) interfere with *opinions*, nor did it require a declaration that the religion of the country was true. Exactly like the existing law of England, which occupies our attention, it only wished to prevent the open denial and contempt of the religion of the country."

Can there be any thing more disingenuous than in this passage to put down as analogous these two things, the law of England restraining infidels from publishing their infidelity, and the Roman law requiring men to burn incense before the images of their Emperors. He might as well have put down, as analogous, the law of England requiring a man not to publish blasphemy, and the law of Spain requiring a man to worship the host; as if he really thought a man no more aggrieved by being required to commit against the light of Christianity an open act of idolatry, than by being restrained from publishing blasphemy against God. He says, indeed, this Roman law did not interfere with *opinions*. He might as well say, the Spanish law did not interfere with *opinions*.

But we draw to a conclusion, and a strange conclusion our readers will consider it to be. They will, by this time, have been convinced that, whether he is right or wrong, the Rev. J. B. White is an indomitable advocate for perfect unlimited freedom of speech and writing on religious subjects. He has told us that "John Search does not express himself favourably to *any* limitation of the freedom of discussion, but that he perfectly concurs in the inference that, if he did so, he would ruin his argument (p. 24); and of course by implication from this assertion, and by what we thought was the burden of his whole book, that he was against *any* limitation of the freedom of discussion; and that *a fortiori*, if he admitted *any* limitation, he would ruin his whole argument. Guess, then, our surprize, when in the 72d page, after 71 pages spent, as we thought, to prove there should be no limitation to the freedom of discussion, we read in his margin, "*Just limitation to the freedom of speech or writing.*" We were under a mistake—we were deceived. Mr. B. White is not an advocate

for unlimited freedom of discussion. He and John Search think the limitations are, by the existing laws, carried too far; but they both advocate the principle of "*just limitation to the freedom of speech or writing.*" We agree with Mr. B. White, that John Search, by his limitations, has entirely ruined his argument; and we think, though perhaps Mr. B. White will not agree with us, that his "*just limitations,*" have entirely ruined his own argument, so much so, that had he consulted us as friends, before he sent his book to the press, we should have told him he might as well have thrown his 71 pages into the fire, as have added the marginal note of the 72d page. He has granted that there should be limitations. Whether his limitations are just or not, is a question of very little importance; yet upon this point we would say a few words, though it is like sitting in judgment on a man who has committed *felo de se*, to settle whether he has given himself the *coup de grace* with all the dexterity that might be expected. This shall be our last quotation.

" But I conceive that the Act which should repeal the present law of libel in regard to religion, might expressly make it penal to employ an unlimited freedom of assertion as to the truth or falsehood of any point of religious belief, for the *direct and express encouragement of any immoral action.*"

According to this, as we thought, radical enemy of all restraint, he would restrain the assertion of the truth of a point of religious belief in some instances. This is, indeed, adding to the quantum of limitation!! But he would likewise restrain "the denial of the truth of a point of religious belief, when made for the express purpose of encouraging any immoral action." We suppose our author means to say, when the writer *expresses his design* to encourage any immoral action; for we think that all infidel publications have a direct and express tendency to encourage immoral actions. Now, taking this to be his meaning; we would ask, is his limitation a wise one? A man may publish and scatter works tending to produce the absence of all religious controul, and so prepare the public, or individuals, for the commission of immoral actions; but if he *expresses* that it is his design, in spreading infidelity, to spread immorality, then our wise legislator would restrain him; that is, as if he would not restrain a man from distributing poison, if he told nobody what bad effects he intended it to produce; but if he, at the same time, avowed he meant the poison to destroy life, he would restrain the distribution of it. Now, we would ask in which of the two cases would the distributor of poison be likely to do most mischief or to get the largest number of persons to take and swallow his draught? Upon his principle he would suffer any licentious infidel to poison the mind of his child or his servant, whilst he kept in his own dark breast the ultimate evil object he had in view; but he would restrain the wretch if he avowed and expressed that it was his object to seduce the daughter from the path of virtue, and the

servant from the ways of honesty and fidelity. We hail him as a convert to our opinions, of the necessity of some restraint; but we should hope he would learn more wisdom in adjusting the peculiar circumstances of that restraint. If we would impress him with the folly of the rule which he has suggested, we would refer him to the saying of the wise man, Prov. i. 17. "Surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird." Infidel writers have been dangerous in proportion as they have taken care not to express the lengths of immorality to which they intended their principles to lead; but others have furnished an antidote to their own poison, when they have prematurely thrown aside the veil, and expressed the encouragement which they gave to immorality and vice.

We have done with Mr. B. White and his book. We have really to apologise to our readers; but as the book was the offspring of our own Review, we perhaps thought we were bound to take more notice of the child than its own merits entitled it to; its claims upon us were those of relationship, and if we have transgressed in the quantum of attention we have bestowed, we trust we shall not be called upon to transgress in a similar way again.

“ONE FACT IS WORTH A CART-LOAD OF
ARGUMENTS;”*

OR,

WHAT IS THE CAUSE OF IRELAND'S POVERTY?

SIR—If you ask, what is the cause of Ireland's poverty? you will get various answers, according to the various prejudices of the persons at whose hands you inquire. One class of persons, for instance, will refer you at once to the tithe-system, and will say, just procure the extinction of tithes, and, as by talismanic power, you will immediately beget peace and good-will in the minds of the people, and thereby elevate the country in contentment, industry, and general prosperity, &c. &c. Now, unfortunately for this theory, as, according to our text, “*One fact is worth a cart-load of arguments*”—we have a FACT that upsets this reasoning altogether. Tithes, for nearly three years, have been put *hors de combat*, in several parishes in some counties of Ireland, and among the rest, in the county where the writer resides. Now what has been the result? The peasantry have become more contented, more industrious, more prosperous, and wealthy, &c.?” No; on the contrary, they have become more rebellious, more idle; and they themselves declare, never were they poorer. The agents to the respective estates in these parishes declare, that they never found it more difficult to collect the rents than now; and the tenantry have become, generally speaking, most unmanageable, most ungracious. Having spoliated the clergy, the people next lay to their wits, how they may rob their landlords. Moreover, having compassed their ends by open violence and plunder, the Divine blessing could not follow: nay, the old adage has been verified,

“ILL GOT ILL GONE.”

What, then, is the cause of Ireland's poverty? Oh, say another class, whose prejudices run in a different way, you are quite wrong: tithes cannot be the cause of our poverty; for if we did not pay the clergy their dues, we should, by an increased rent, have *far more* to pay the landlord, as is proved in the case of all properties free of tithe. Moreover, what the Ministers of the Established Church get, they, for the most part liberally spend in the country; yea, and far beyond, through their private incomes. If you get rid of the clergy, where will you have, in many parts, any private country gentlemen? Where will be the supporters of the poor? Where the contributors to parish charities, &c.? The cry against the tithes has been raised by

* Mr. O'Connell's speech.

many heartless landlords, who would put the amount into their own pockets; but no relief would come hereby to us, the occupying tenants, by any means. No; if you wish to solve the mystery of Ireland's poverty, read it in the history of her absenteeism. The absentees! yes, here is the tale of our country's ruin; here is the root of the evil. "*Hinc illæ lachrymæ.*" Make but the absentees return, and spend their vast incomes in their native land, and we at once possess the sinews of industry, of contentment, of happiness, &c. Now against this doctrine we likewise oppose a stubborn *fact*. Which have been the counties most disturbed, most lawless, most distressed? Kilkenny, Tipperary, Cork, Queen's County!! The very counties wherein absenteeism *least* prevails; which command the largest number of resident gentry.

Again, what part of Ireland has been uniformly most peaceable, industrious, happy? *the North!* But where doth absenteeism more predominate, Londonderry especially, (as its derivation proves,) belongs almost exclusively to foreign merchants: but where do you find such thrift, advancement, loyalty, and general weal, as on the estates of these absentee companies! Behold, then, in this a volume of testimony, and with it we close here our argument.

What, then, is the cause of Ireland's poverty? We answer in one word—**POPERY**; or, to be more specific still, the **POPISH PRIESTHOOD OF IRELAND**. Our remark above may be retorted against us, and it may be said, you write altogether under the influence of prejudice. Well, "*One FACT is worth a cart-load of arguments,*" and accordingly we shall sustain our assertion simply by a **FACT**. An agent in a certain part of Ireland, among other properties, had to collect the rent of two town-lands, situate as follows: The one town-land was inhabited by Protestants—the other by Roman Catholics. The leases on the Protestant town-land having a few years hence expired, the rent on the tenantry became considerably raised. The leases on the Roman Catholic town-land are as yet unexpired, and it being an old let the tenantry have but a few shillings per acre to pay for their land. You will say, whatever difficulty the agent may have in collecting the rents of the former town-land, he can have none in the latter. Quite the contrary. The agent told the writer of this article, nothing surprised him more than the difference observable in these two districts. If he go into the one, or the Protestant district, he there, for the most part sees good houses, nicely white-washed, well-divided and well-fenced farms; the people industrious and peaceable, and willing to discharge their increased rents. If he go into the other, or the Roman Catholic district, here are miserable and filthy huts—bad husbandry—the people idle and discontented, and extremely reluctant to pay the few shillings per acre laid upon them. The agent was most anxious to discover the real cause of all this, and especially why he should always have so much more trouble in collecting the

small rent of the Roman Catholic, than the large rent of the Protestant. To many inquiries how the anomaly was to be accounted for, he was oftentimes told that the whole secret lay in the difference of their religions; that the same results were just as apparent, for instance, in the Protestant and Roman Catholic cantons of Switzerland, and in other countries; that pure Protestantism is always identified with cleanliness, morality, and general civilization; whereas pure Popery is uniformly identified with filthiness and sloth, if not with disorderly and demoralized habits. "Well," he said, "it MAY be so; but I want to know WHY it is so; and still more particularly, as it is that wherein I am individually interested, I wish to know why, under the most favourable circumstances, the Roman Catholic tenantry of my employer are, as a body, poor, indigent, depressed. I want not to be told in the abstract that it is Popery, but I want some palpable, some tangible demonstration. The following circumstance soon occurring, at once opened his eyes—fully and satisfactorily explained the plague-sore of this evil. A Roman Catholic, in the above district, having died, ordered, by his will, that he should have a *decent funeral*; that *SIXTY MASSES* should be said for his soul; and that he should have a *MONTH'S MIND*! The executors to the will, after his decease, meet to settle how these expenses are to be defrayed. The man had left behind him a cow, two pigs, and the farm full cropped. There was no rent due, as he had held the land, which was good, and an old take, at a few shillings per acre. The executors decree that the cow, the two pigs, and half the crop should go to cover the above charges; and that the other half of the crop, with the land, should be left to the heir, the only child of the deceased, a lad of about nineteen years, rather thick-skulled, and slobbish, and heavy—still possessed of a little of the "*Crass a Minerva*"—of mother wit, as we call it—able to reason points in his own way and fashion. Accordingly they have the decent funeral; plenty of pipes, and tobacco, and whiskey!—fees and entertainment for the priest, &c. For all this the cow and one pig are sold. Then come the masses and the month's mind. To supply funds for these, the other pig and the half crop are to come into the market. But here, behold, a sudden opposition starts up. Our heir, the goosoon Paddy, thinks the executors have made quite sufficiently free with his property, in having sold his cow and one pig; and on their coming to seize the second, he demurs, saying he did not see why his father's soul required so many as sixty masses. Paddy argues thus: "If my father, who always had the priest, went regularly to his chapel and confession, was sober and honest, &c., must have sixty masses to get his soul out of purgatory, how many masses will James Lynch want, who is always drunk, disorderly, never goes near the chapel or the priest?" The argument, though a good one, did not prevail; words ran high, and finally they agreed to leave the determination to his Honour, the agent. It was exactly the case this gentleman wished to

come before him, as likely to put him in possession of the very kind of information he had been long anxiously looking for. On an appointed day the parties accordingly meet. The case of the masses is first discussed. The agent asks, in the first place, what the price of each mass might be? It is answered, that the priest will charge persons in their moderate condition ONLY one shilling per mass. Well, sixty masses, at one shilling per, make three pounds—a large sum! Young Paddy thinks that ten masses should do his Father's soul very well. However, after much altercation, the amount is adjusted at the round dozen. That matter being settled, next comes on the question of the month's mind. The expression is quite new to his Honour, and he inquires what is the meaning of this priestly service? He is informed that there are two ways of performing it. 1st. The priest comes to the house of the deceased; the neighbours are invited, and then there is what they call a jollification, or *gallores* of eating and drinking; and when they are done, each neighbour invited puts his contribution for the priest under his plate. A very rich neighbour will sometimes put a pound for the priest under his plate; and the writer of this article has heard of so much as a FIVE-POUND-NOTE been sent by a very rich Roman Catholic, as his contribution towards the month's-mind jollification, he himself not being able personally to be present. This is the decent, or respectable, and expensive mode of managing the month's mind. The second way is to give the priest a guinea for himself, and he performs his office at his own house, or the chapel. The agent declares it as his opinion, that the cheapest way is the best way. To this our young Paddy assents, but still wishes to honour his Father's memory as much as possible, and therefore has a leaning to have the month's mind done after the first manner; the great additional expense is the only obstacle. However a happy thought suggests itself, viz. that the priest come to the house; that the neighbours, as usual, be invited; but that his Honour tell them all to eat and drink at home beforehand, that hereby the expense of the jollification consist merely in entertaining the priest. "Oh!" replied the agent, "my good lad, that is out of the question; for if a jollification the neighbours are to have, they will make it to be a real, and not a mock jollification; they will come determined to eat and to drink till they are ready to burst." His honour, therefore, advised that the second kind of the month's mind be resorted to, or that a guinea be given to the priest; and with this counsel he dismissed the parties.

Now here is a stubborn FACT; let us analyze it, in order to see the impoverishing system of Popish superstition, and of priestly domination. *Ex uno disce omnes*. Had the deceased been a Protestant, how had he left his only son? Not to mention the larger independence which Protestant industry, working on such an advantageous farm, would most likely have realized, let us take matters just as we find them. As a Protestant, the deceased had left

his son the cow, the two pigs, and a full crop, together with his cheap, unencumbered farm, to begin the world with. Instead of which the priest, through the executors, would reduce Paddy at once to *HALF A CROP!* But this is not all—indeed only the commencement; for, by and by, Lent coming on, the priest goes up to Paddy, and says, “Why, man, you want a house-keeper. Do you not see Nelly Sullivan yonder; she is a clean, decent, thrifty girl; why don’t you make up to her? And mind, make haste, for Lent is coming on, and if you be not married soon, you then must wait for forty days. Thus are introduced upon our Paddy all the charges of a wedding—priest’s dues, entertainment, &c., besides the fatal improvidence of a too early marriage. Moreover, after a year or so, behold the fees and entertainment for baptism; and when these expenses, and stations, and confessions, for himself and his wife, &c. &c. become deducted from the produce of the farm, how much, we would be glad to know, can remain behind in the way of rent for the landlord, or how is Paddy ever to be an independent man.

That the above is no exaggerated statement of priestly exaction, we refer to the late trial between Major Bingham and the Priest of Urris. From what came out on that trial, it could be deduced that the priest’s income, as a minimum, was £700 per annum—as a maximum, about £1,100 per annum!! This, too, in perhaps the very poorest district in Ireland. If priests, by the invention of purgatories and masses, &c. can extract such incomes from the poor districts in Ireland, how much then, *a fortiori*, from the rich? The fact is, that the incomes of the WORKING clergy of the Established Church bear no proportion, generally speaking, to the incomes of the priest—the former are so much less; and accordingly, some years ago, when Priest Dickson came over to be a minister of the Establishment, he declared his pecuniary sacrifices were immense in vacating his living in the Roman Catholic Church.

We would finally remark, that the priest’s dues or charges always rise in proportion to the wealth of the individual. We have an example at hand. A young Roman Catholic was lately left heir to a large patrimonial property. His father commanded in his will that an enormous number of masses should be said for the release of his soul from purgatory. The heir accordingly goes to the priest, and asks him how much the church will charge for so many masses? The priest, knowing the great wealth of the young man, names a most extravagant sum. The young man demurs; the priest is obstinate. What is to be done? According to the *will* the masses *must* be said; a lucky expedient suggests itself. The heir has a friend going out in one of Don Pedro’s vessels to Portugal; he forwards a message by him to the church in that country, to know the lowest amount at which masses for the dead will be said there. He is returned for answer at so much—a rate of purgatorial deliverance 200 or 300 per cent. below the Irish market. Our young heir clinches the bargain, saves

his money, and has the masses for his father's soul performed in Portugal!! Ye rich Roman Catholics, take the hint, and if the priest attempt to stretch the string too tight, you know where your business will be done cheaply. *Competition is the life of trade.*

N. B. The history of masses for the dead is somewhat as follows (we give it as it refers to the demise of a very rich Roman Catholic; and we lay the scene of the occurrence in Dublin, Cork, or some large town where many priests reside):—The bishop, and as many priests as the friends of the deceased wish, assemble at the house of the deceased—sometimes thirty, forty, or fifty priests. Three are selected to celebrate High Mass; one acting as High Priest—and the other two as deacon and sub-deacon. After this, three Psalms and three lessons (chiefly from the book of Job) are repeated by the other priests in rotation; again three Psalms and three lessons, and so on, as we say *ad infinitum*. These Psalms, &c. are repeated as fast as tongue can utter them. After the whole is over, the bishop, priests, and invited friends, dine together at the expense of the heir or heirs of the deceased. For this the bishop may get £4 or £5; the high priest £2; the deacon and sub-deacon £1 each; and the other priests 5s. or 2s. 6d. each. After a month (hence the derivation of the *month's mind*) the same ceremonies are repeated; and at the end of another month, or a year, &c. again, if desired, and payment made. The carnal feasting on those occasions, in some places, is termed emphatically a *JOLLIFICATION*, perhaps in consequence of the supposed ease given to the soul in purgatory, or, according to the technical expression, “the repose of the soul.” But it would not suit this money-making trade to declare the actual deliverance of the soul from purgatory; this period the Romish Church does not profess to be put in possession of; hence masses have been known to be said, e. g. for kings, queens, &c. (the kings, &c. of France, Spain, England, &c.) for FIFTY, yea, for a HUNDRED YEARS, and thereby the Romish coffers filling!!! The private masses are left to the discretion of the particular priest engaged to be said when or where he pleases, and he makes his bargain as he can; however, the lowest rate is one shilling per mass; and there is no Roman Catholic that dies, leaving behind him any substance, but what has a greater or smaller number of masses said for his soul. Now, from the above facts (and the writer obtained his information from one initiated—from a converted Roman Catholic priest, who had oftentimes been a performer in such things himself; *Quorum pars magna fuit*) it can easily be calculated what a revenue is derived to the Romish Church from this one species of spiritual traffic alone; and, moreover, it can be seen why priests are so strenuous in their advocacy for the dogma of purgatory. “*Rem, rem, quocumque modo rem!*” Well might Leo X. exclaim, when pocketing the inordinate sums from the sale of Indulgences, “Truly this Christianity is a profitable scheme.” Or, influenced by the same principle (the *φιλαργυρία*),

might impious Tetzl (though contrary to the declared position of his church, who says the time of purgatorial deliverance is not known) exclaim, "The moment the *money tinkles in the chest*, your father's soul mounts up out of purgatory." Verily, verily, a most convenient religion for the RICH; but, alas! what for the POOR! Yet "to the POOR is the GOSPEL preached."

R. C.

CONFORMITY TO THE WORLD.

IN REPLY TO "H. W."

SIR,—In thinking over the remarks of your correspondent, "H. W." which appeared on the above subject in your number for April, the impression was strongly made on my mind, that when put forward for indiscriminate circulation, prudence would have suggested either a modification or an explanation of observations, which, however wise and harmless *some* of them might be, when addressed to a *single-eyed, self-denying, and devoted Christian*, certainly seem particularly fitted for perversion to *at least selfish excess*, by the lukewarm and self-indulgent *professor*, and by the *half-hearted* real Christian; and fitted also to supply a severe and unhallowed scourge in the merciless hands of the devotees of this world, wherewith to harrass, perhaps, their children, their relatives, or any others over whom they may have influence or controul, and who may evince a fixed resolvedness to walk along that narrow road which *alone* leads to eternal habitation with the blessedness of God.

Let me, for brevity, say, that with the most part of H. W.'s paper, as containing statements which are *in themselves*, and *by themselves*, *abstractedly* true, I in the main agree; or rather think I agree with what is in his mind upon the subject; so that regarding the greater part of *what* he has said, I shall not have any controversy. Many (but not all) of the opinions which he has expressed may be true and safe, *if used in that degree in which a God-loving and honestly conscientious mind will use them*; but it is from the unguarded *manner* in which they are sent forth, that, considering the selfish heart of man, the dishonest and unupright consciences of all mere professors, and of many, alas! too many who are real Christians, I cannot but fear an evil result.

I am aware that there are some whose well intentioned, pure and devoted hearts, have instigated them to abstain from even the *moderate* use of those gracious gifts of their covenant Father which He intended "not to be refused, but to be received with thanksgiving of them that believe and know the truth;" such have existed in all ages of the Church; and their exemplary

holiness begets in the mind of the spectator the illusion that these persons are infallible, and that in their walk is to be seen, without possibility of error, the precise path in every particular which their Lord would have to be pursued by all his genuine disciples. It is our opinion that a more cheerful, *yet moderate*, use of the blessings graciously dispensed to such persons would glorify their bounteous Master, and win others to his service, more than the excessive abstinence which they have laid on themselves, many of them, indeed, to the injury of their health and the unfitting of themselves and their families for the service which they love; and to such persons, therefore, I would gladly convey many of H. W.'s observations, if I could do so without bringing them before the self-partial eyes of those who, naming the name of the Saviour, yet "consider more their own things than the things which are Jesus Christ's." And yet methinks that even with the very devoted disciples of whom we have spoken, H. W.'s observations would have much more weight, had not their conscientiousness (amounting nearly to partial statement), their want of limitation in speaking of external conformity to the world, seemed calculated to throw open the door to the self-indulging professor, and to the poor-hearted, half-devoted Christian, to lavish upon the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, nearly the entire of that worldly substance, which, if rightly used, would have at once maintained them duly and comfortably in their station in life, and advanced the interests of His kingdom, who thought not his own life too precious to be sacrificed for their rescue from ruin.

From what has been said it will be easily seen that I am not an ascetic; neither do I advocate extremes; but I confess I cannot see any limit set by H. W.'s paper to the external worldliness of professors of religion. H. W. is not unacquainted with the deceitful selfishness of the human heart; and if once even a vital Christian have deceived himself into the idea that an unconstrained liberty is allowed him in the different branches of his expenditure (and such is very much the tendency of the paper in question), luxuries and superfluities will speedily assume the form of necessities; and attention to self will soon wither the mistaken and deceived heart into little better than being the centre of a contracted world, of which self is nearly the utmost limit; and consideration of other's wants will only be cherished so far as by its *bare existence* to serve as the *shadow*, at least, of a Christian grace so peremptorily called for by the word of God; and with which, therefore, conscience, however deceived, could hardly dispense altogether.

I fear that amongst the upper classes especially, religion walks much in silver slippers and on velvet cushions, they delight themselves in abundance of "talk," and are content with (not to say more) a very shallow measure of divine grace. External conformity to the world is a hot-bed in which this lean estate thrives

mightily; and we cannot avoid regarding any statements tending in any degree to sanction unchecked external conformity, sent forth to the public view, especially in a Christian Magazine, and more especially still, bearing initials which hold considerable influence on the religious public, as exceedingly hurtful in every way to the interests of the Divine kingdom.

The hearts of the wealthy and exalted in life require, for the most part, but little incentive to the maintenance of such establishments and expenditure as are pleasing to flesh and blood; their station, too, seems to have peculiar snares to beguile them into such maintenance; and does not experience testify that in the main instead of contributions to public charities, religious institutions, &c. flowing in from the rich and great of this world, at all in proportion to their means, support comes to such institutions in a far, very far, greater proportionate degree from the givings of those who, with a very moderate supply of this world's goods, have so arranged their households as to have much to spare for the Lord; whilst the others, compelled by vanity and pride, and not by a conscientious and holy regard to the decorum allowed to their station, maintain expenses far beyond what is needful to keep that decorum up, and give out of their abundance merely what costs them not so much as a thought.

But, Sir, there is one statement of your correspondent as to which I would beg of him to reflect whether it is not *in itself* and *by itself* contrary to the Word of God, and in its consequences of even worse tendency than any other part of his paper. I allude to the part (towards the end) in which he says, that it is not the office of religion to regulate in *these* matters, and that religion is not meant to teach or instruct the rich with regard to the measure, &c. of their expenditure and establishments.

I am aware that the main and primary business of religion is with the heart, and that if it have not converted that, external performances, however numerous and rigid, are as fruitless to save the soul, as it would be ineffectual, in order to give life and sap to a decayed tree, to fasten to its branches green leaves plucked from some other tree; but when religion has vitally renewed the heart, we know that, if diligence be given to make the calling and election sure, it does not stop until all the branches of action in life are brought under its *regulating*, moderating, and reforming influence; and it surely requires but little reflection to see, that it is not scriptural to assert that religion has nothing to do in regulating, nothing in moderating, the outward style and pomp of its professors. I do not say that religion calls for a levelling of worldly distinctions, for the laying aside or extinguishment of ranks in society; *to this opinion I make not the remotest approach*; but I do say, that religion's Author, to whom all we have belongs, is very much concerned, indeed, whether we lavish on ourselves, in ministering to the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, the substance of which we

are but stewards; or whether we so lay ourselves out as to deny ourselves, and cherish with fostering care the interests of his cause. And we decidedly think there is much bearing upon this subject in the texts, "Honour the Lord with thy substance, and with the first fruits of all thy increase"—"Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do *all* to the glory of God"—as well as in many other texts which might be adduced.

Again I would repeat that I have little doubt that were I to meet in conversation with H. W., and hear *his explanation* of his own sentiments, I should not have very much controversy with *what is in his mind* upon the subject; but when I consider the tendency of his paper, resulting from the *unguarded manner* in which *he has given utterance* to what was in his mind; and the *very pervertible expressions* in which his sentiments are couched, I cannot avoid regarding the probable injury as incalculable; and I can only hope ardently, that few have been found to receive or act upon the statements of frail and erring man, without having first weighed them prayerfully and impartially with the letter and tenor of the true sayings of God.

M. LAYMAN.

S. N.'s ANSWER TO REV. JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—Your observations upon *John Search* having been replied to by the Rev. J. B. White, in a pamphlet with a postscript, in which I have the honor of being noticed, I shall beg your insertion of a few cursory remarks, which may serve as a concomitant to that decisive refutation which I confidently expect to see from your own pen.

I must begin by protesting against J. B. White's motto. *Sentire quæ velis* is not in my list of the rights of man. Belief should be governed by *Reason*, not by *Will*. It is sinful, in all matters in which religion or morals are concerned, to suffer our wishes to have any influence upon our understanding. The remaining part of the motto, *Quæ velis dicere*, goes to an extent at which *John Search* himself appears to hesitate. His complaint is, that the law attacks publications in which *neither the existence nor the goodness; neither the wisdom, the mercy, or the overruling Providence of God, nor the obligation of human duties, nor the future responsibility of man* are questioned, (p. 4.) Thus admitting, that if these had been questioned, the attack would have been justifiable.

I must next question J. B. White's use of the word *opinion*, defended though it be by the *very acute and philosophical note* which he gives us from *John Search*.

The meaning of the word *opinion*, is a question of fact; and we have the high authority of *Johnson* for saying that it signifies *persuasion of the mind, without proof or certain knowledge*; and he supports his opinion by the authorities of Ben Johnson, Hale, and Wilkins, who tell us that it is a *light, vain, crude, and imperfect thing, settled in the imagination, but never arriving at the understanding*. That *opinion* is, *when the assent of the understanding is so far gained by the evidence of probability that it rather inclines to one persuasion than to another*; and that *time wears out the fictions of opinion, and doth, by degrees, discover and unmask the fallacy of ungrounded persuasion*. This last, indeed, supplies us with the authority of *Cicero*, being a translation of his *Opinionum commenta delet dies*.

When *John Search*, therefore, says that the truth of Scripture is *matter of opinion*, he asserts that our belief in it is a *light, vain, crude, and imperfect thing, settled in the imagination, but never arriving at the understanding*; such being the meaning which the word conveys to every one acquainted with the English language, and *John Search* having no right to give new meaning to our words. To suppose that he, an Englishman, as it is said, did not perceive the effect which his use of the word was calculated to produce, would be to detract from his *philo-*

sophistical acuteness: that a believer in Christianity should have been desirous of producing that effect, I find it difficult, indeed, to persuade myself. This J. B. White does not feel, probably because he may not have that quick perception of the nice discriminations of words which belongs to those who speak the language in which they were born.

It appears to be from this cause that he substitutes, (p. 70,) *the doing to others as we wish to be done by*, for the words of the Gospel, *whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you*; not perceiving that the latter form of expression indicates deliberate determination, while the former implies merely desire, uncontrolled by reason.

While upon this subject of criticism let me notice an attack made upon Lardner and Paley.

The former is charged (p. 50, N.) with misinterpreting an Epigram of Martial's, lib. 10, epia. 25, and with proposing an absurd alteration, in order to support the meaning he gives to it. I have the passage in Lardner now before me, vol. 7, p. 260 (ed. Lon. 1788,) and there is no alteration proposed in the text!

Lardner refers to T. Le Moyne, *Varia Sacra*, p. 1041, for the interpretation alluded to, and gives Le Moyne's remarks at full length. He gives, also, the interpretation of the epigram which J. B. White prefers, but expresses an unfavourable opinion of it, in which I certainly agree with him; and must continue to prefer that of Le Moyne till I am shown, in a classic author, the words *non facio* for *I will not*. The expression used by Martial for *I will not*, is *non faciam*, l. 7, epia. 77. To find *non facio* used for *I do not sacrifice*, would not, I apprehend, be difficult.

The alteration which J. B. White imputes to Lardner, appears only in Paley. *Foran thure marum*. He says nothing of where he found it, nor offers any defence for proposing it. Perhaps, having got the first prize for Latin essay, against the whole University of Cambridge, he might have thought his own authority sufficient to support the conjecture.

As to the censure which J. B. White casts upon Lardner for having translated *Circense ludicrum*, a mock *Circensian game*, the answer is easily given; Lardner does not so translate it; he gives the passage in these words, (vol. 7, p. 254,) *Nero made use of his own gardens as a theatre, upon this occasion, and also exhibited the diversions of the circus*. And Paley, not giving a close translation of the passage, but rather relating the transaction in his own words, has it thus: *Nero lent his own gardens for these executions, and exhibited, at the same time, a mock Circensian entertainment*: obviously using this form of expression to mark that the gardens were the scene of the entertainment, and not the Circus itself. But to offer any argument to prove that Paley was competent to understand a common passage in a Latin Classic, would really be a waste of words—

Sed hæc hactenus.

J. B. White appears, (p. 6,) to estimate very lightly the discovery, as he imagines it to be, which *John Search* has made, of the right of every individual *Quæ sentiat dicere*. Had he been aware that the discovery was made an hundred years since, by an illiterate artizan, and that it had died a natural death, according to the observation of Cicero, *opinionum commenta delet dies*, his view of it might probably have been changed. Had he looked back to Diogenes, who carried the two principles, *sentias quæ velis*, and *quæ sentias dicere*, and suited the action to the words, he would have seen the system in its wicked deformity, and shrunk from it with horror.

It is not difficult to account for the error of J. B. White. He had seen and suffered from persecution in its most odious form, and naturally started back to the opposite extreme, forgetting the maxim, *Medio tutissimus ibis*.

It is more difficult to account for his adopting the gross misrepresentation of *John Search*, and calling the common law, which makes the denial of Christianity a misdemeanour, and the statute law which makes it, if the denier had been a Christian, liable to specific punishment, *the favourite law of the Parsons*! I will not use the language which this deliberate repetition of an inexcusable mistatement loudly calls for—I shall only say, that had the law been made by the *Parsons*, to favour their own interests, it would have protected the peculiar doctrines of the Church to which they belong; instead of which it protects all Christian sects equally: not merely the Established Church, but the Socinian, the Papist, the Anabaptist, and the Quaker.

Let me now come to what is said by J. B. White, directly against myself:

I quoted Lord Belingbroke to prove that the Infidels of his day, the most flourishing period of Deism, maintained the same opinion which is now advocated by *John Search*, lest in giving the instance of Chubb I might appear to be arguing *e singulari*. I believed *John Search* to be an infidel, and a very dangerous one, and I deemed it important to unmask him. That J. B. White is blind to the danger, only brings to my mind the words of Cicero, *Eo magis refert me mihi atque vobis simere*.

I had observed upon the general laziness which leads men to acquiesce in what is put forward as an argument, and to believe what is stated as a fact, and on this J. B. White observes, that he never found such laziness except when people read arguments and facts which support their own opinions, (p. 91.)

And is J. B. White really so little aware of what is passing around him, as not to know that a great multitude, and of those in high places too, may be found ready to catch at any excuse for freeing themselves from the yoke of Christianity!

J. B. White next observes, that I have charged *John Search* with representing the law as more strict than it really is, and that I allow that judges *apply* it with more or less latitude, according to their own opinions; and remarks that this is a poor

consolation to those who suffer in consequence of the *judgment* passed upon them, (p. 92.)

This is a strange specimen of confusion of ideas. I had observed that judges had used loose and oratorical language in their speeches, when commenting upon anti-religious libels, but I never said that they took any liberty in their *judgments*, or stretched their sentences beyond the strict limits of the law, as J. B. White here more than insinuates. I did not allow that judges *applied* the law with a latitude suited to their own feelings, or gratified those feelings by suitable *judgments*. If I had, I should have pronounced a gross libel upon them.

I observed, (p. 9,) upon *John Search's* sarcasms upon the *delicate, sensitive, and shrinking vitality of Christianity*, as a proof of his infidelity, and J. B. White reminds me that Christianity is not a person!

Did J. B. White never hear of the figure called *Prosopopæia*!

I had observed, (p. 16,) that were a book written to show that all the doctrines of Christianity were capable of being proved by reason, yet, though such a book might be deemed unfavorable to Christianity, the author could not be prosecuted; and to this observation J. B. White replies, that no stronger proof could be given of a law being nugatory, than that it allows that to be actually done which it was intended to prevent, (p. 93.)

Let the law speak for itself, and say what it does intend to prevent. It is strictly limited to prohibiting the denial of the truth of Christianity. And this it does in order to prevent the evil passions of the ill-disposed and the ignorant from being excited by dishonest arts of sophistry, which *John Search* himself, by laying down rules which ought to be observed in discussing such a question, admits might be resorted to without breach of the law, were it permitted to pronounce that Christianity is false. This I had so plainly stated, (pp. 37, 38,) that J. B. White must see, if he takes the trouble of reading the passage referred to, that I had answered him by anticipation.

J. B. White states that he cannot understand what is meant by the truth of Christianity in general. I really cannot help his not understanding what the Legislature in the time of William the Third plainly defined, and what Hale, and Raymond, and Kenyon, and Ellenborough, and Best, and Bayly, found no difficulty in understanding.

J. B. White asserts that the law was established for the protection, not of Christianity in general, but of Popery. Surely he knows that these expressions are not a description of the common law, to which the term *Established* cannot be with propriety applied, its nature being best understood by the analogy which I used in quoting the words of Horace, *crescit occulto velut arbor ævo*. And as to the statute protection of Christianity J. B. White must have fallen into very deep obliviousness if he thought it enacted for the defence of Popery.

J. B. White replies to my concluding words: *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*; with a sneer.

De gustibus non est disputandum—I deal not in sarcasm. I do not resort to my wishes, nor to my fancies, nor my prejudices, to govern my reason. I quoted words which were employed in pronouncing a deliberate determination on an important question—I have now seen what support can be given by ability and zeal to *John Search's* doctrines, and am confirmed in my judgment that they are equally mischievous and erroneous.

I cannot conclude without noticing the observations in the Appendix upon the effects of Atheism. They are given as a comment upon what is designated as Warburton's *fanciful demonstration* of the Divine legation of Moses, which J. B. White states to have been founded on a supposed axiom that no civil society could exist without a belief in a God. This is not a true account of Warburton's system. What he undertakes to prove is, that every legislator, except Moses, connected his civil polity with the belief of a future state, as necessary to its stability; and that it is impossible to suppose Moses to have declined the aid of that belief unless he had a reliance upon an immediate Providence, and that reliance he could not have acted upon had he not been convinced that it was well founded. Warburton argues from an induction of facts, extending to every civilized society that is known to have existed, except the Jews, and to every legislator who had founded or reformed a state, (he might have added, every philosopher who had written an *Utopia*,) Moses alone excepted. The notions, with respect to atheism, which J. B. White appears to entertain, are thus condemned by the universal voice of mankind. That after the effects of national atheism had been made manifest in France, such notions should have been seriously advocated I scarcely can believe, even while I read them.

S. N.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

The Letters that we annex are extracted from an English Paper, and in their connexion present a striking comment upon Popish liberality and toleration. Our readers are aware of the discussion at Downside, between some Protestant and Roman Catholic Clergymen, which was carried on for several days, and, as might have been expected, terminated in the acknowledged defeat of the Popish champions. Not satisfied with his defeat, and smarting under the consciousness of it, Rev. Mr. Browne, the Professor of Theology at Downside, and the principal combatant on the Romish side, since he was foiled at syllogistic weapons, endeavoured, more Romano, to call in the strong arm of power, and to crush his opponents, whom he could not crush by reasoning, by the weight of official censure. He actually wrote and printed in the Bath Journal, a Letter to the Protestant Bishop of Bath and Wells, calling upon him to silence his Protestant Clergy, who dared to write and speak against Popery; and to suppress, by his authority, the Reformation Society in his diocese! Certainly, a more conspicuous instance of the *impudence*—we can discover no more refined term to characterize such conduct—never marked the proceedings of the Scarlet Lady. To this, our countryman Mr. Nangle, replied, and no recommendation of ours is necessary to cause attention to his Letters:

TO THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP
OF BATH AND WELLS.

MY LORD BISHOP—Your Lordship has not been, I presume, indifferent to the public discussion between the Reformation Society, and myself and friends, which has recently been conducted at this place, and to which the attention of a large portion of your diocese has been directed.

On the occasion of your lordship's visit, a few years since, to Downside College, the only occasion whereon I have had the honour of conversing with you, I was highly gratified by the Christian sentiment which you expressed towards the Roman Catholics of this kingdom, against whom the lash of persecution had for centuries been raised. "Although, observed your lordship, we may differ from each other upon certain doctrines of faith, yet we ought to be united by the common bond of charity, which is the greatest of the theological virtues." Seldom have I heard any thing more congenial with the sentiments which I love to cherish; and, on more than one occasion, when the duty of self-defence has compelled me to enter the lists of public theological controversy, I have successfully opposed the language uttered by your lordship, to the violent ebullitions of mistaken zeal or popular prejudices.

Sure am I, therefore, that your lordship will disapprove of the causes which rendered necessary, on my part, the recent discussion. Calumnies against our creed, my lord, of an unjustifiable nature; calumnies most offensive to every Roman Catholic, and especially to the members of this establishment, at whom, in particular, they were pointed, had for months—nay, for years, been circulated, by means of lying tracts, amongst our neighbours, our tenants, and our very day labourers;—and these had been frequently accompanied by libellous whispers and insinuations against our moral conduct. The tendency of such proceedings was to hold us up as objects of public suspicion and abhorrence; yet had we, upon no occasion, given the slightest provocation for those unchristianlike aggressions upon our feelings as men and as believers.

"Now, my lord, it is not undeserving of your lordship's attention

to consider from whom such wanton attacks have been made; what has been their immediate results; what is likely to be the consequence of their continuance.

They have originated with imprudent zealots, claiming to be the staunch supporters of the Established Church; nay more, with clergymen subject to your lordship's jurisdiction. The immediate results have been—to expose the ignorance and malice of our calumniators, who, when called upon either to cease their aggressions, or to attempt to substantiate their foul charges, have shown that they had not enough of Christian charity for the one, nor of ability for the other—to alienate from them the esteem and confidence of several who had been made the dupes of their unholy stratagems, and to produce a reaction in favour of the insulted and falsified Roman Catholic principles. Another result has been to extend into this part of your lordship's diocese a ramification of a society, formed for the alleged purpose of propagating *the principles of the Reformation*. But, my lord, your acquaintance with the history of that eventful period is not calculated to secure the patronage of a Bishop of the Established Church to a society which embraces almost every variety of those manifold sects, whose schismatical separation from the Church of England no sincere adherent of that church can fail to deplore;—to a society whose fundamental principle, that “the Bible is the only rule of faith, upon the meaning of the contents of which every meanest outcast of society is commanded to exercise his judgment,” aims a death-blow at all teaching authority and ecclesiastical government, and which has on that account, been loudly condemned by many distinguished divines of your lordship's communion;—to a society amenable

to no ecclesiastical tribunal for the doctrines that it puts forth:—to a society from whose interference result no very complimentary reflections upon the capacity or activity of your benefited clergy;—to a society which has again and again made dissensions and animosities the lamentable substitutes for former harmony and mutual good will;—to a society which has failed in its avowed purpose of engaging Roman Catholics to abandon the security of their church, preserved from error by the promises of Christ, for the insecurity and unsteadiness of private judgment, and has, moreover, by provoking a spirit of inquiry, been the unwilling occasion, under God, of many conversions to the Catholic faith.

What is likely to be the consequence of a continuation by your clergy of such wicked aggressions as I have described above, upon the religious belief and practice of Catholics, your Lordship's acute judgment will easily foresee. Is this, my lord, a time for your church to add to its active enemies? Catholics can have no motive, except the sacred obligation of self-defence against wanton provocations, for preferring to the present Established Church, which claims from ours its orders, and has much of its liturgy, and which we must esteem

“The least deformed, because reformed the least.”

Those more modern theorists, who however are perhaps destined by heaven to be the avengers of the Catholic Church, upon its ancient oppressors in this country.

“Trusting that your lordship will receive with indulgence this long epistle, I remain, my lord,

Your respectful servant,

T. J. BROWN.

Downside College,
March 12, 1834.

TO THE REV. T. J. BROWN, &c. &c.

Sir—Your Letter to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, which appeared in the Bath Journal of Monday last, is now before me; and as the manifest design of that production is, to engage public opinion against that system of vigorous and zealous opposition with which the encroachments and aggressions of Romish ecclesiastics in this kingdom must be met by every consistent member of the Established Church; I claim the right, as a minister of that Church, in self-vindication, to offer a few observations upon your statements.

I cannot think, Sir, that your assertion, that "the lash of persecution" had been raised against Roman Catholics for centuries, is calculated to promote the growth of those feelings of "charity," in reference to their Protestant fellow-subjects, which you are professedly so anxious to cherish. But is this assertion founded on fact? Did Protestantism wield the temporal power with which Providence nerved her arm, to avenge on the Church of Rome the blood of the slaughtered millions of her children? Were the barbarous cruelties, perpetrated at the instigation of the Romish Ecclesiastics, on the professors of Protestant doctrine, in the valleys of Piedmont, in France, Spain, Italy, the Low Countries, and England, ever retaliated? Has the Protestant Establishment ever set up an Inquisition, for inflicting retributive vengeance for the bloody treachery of the St. Bartholomew's massacre, and the not less bloody designs of the Gunpowder Plot? Whatever civil restrictions Roman Catholics may have been subjected to, must be traced, not to a spirit of persecution in Protestantism, but to the peculiar character of their own principles; for it must be admitted that men who had surrendered the keeping of their consciences to ecclesiastics, who could exult over the cold-blooded massacre of 30,000 of their fellow-creatures, because they were Protestants, and who could consider this foulest instance of cruelty and

treachery which stains the history of our species as a fit subject for solemn thanksgiving to Almighty God—it must be admitted, I say, that men who, having submitted to the guidance of such teachers, had so imbibed their spirit, as to esteem it to be not only justifiable, but commendable, to destroy at one fell blow a Protestant King, and a Protestant Parliament, incapacitated themselves for enjoying under a Protestant Government the fulness of privilege possessed by others, whose creed was not inimical to civil tranquillity.

The sentiment which you attribute to the Bishop of Bath and Wells next claims attention. You represent his lordship, on the occasion of a visit to your College at Downside, as saying, "Although we may differ from each other, upon certain doctrines of faith, yet we ought to be united in the common bond of charity, which is the greatest of the theological virtues." If, Sir, in this quotation of the bishop's words, you mean to represent his lordship as asserting, that we should regard the persons of those who may differ from us in points of doctrine with unmingled kindness, most cordially do I assent to the sentiment; but if your design be, as the sequel of your letter proves it is, to dis sever the connexion between right belief and right practice—between faith and *scriptural morality* or holiness; we are at once at issue. I am aware, Sir, that the tone of indifference, in reference to points of doctrine which you have assumed, well accords with the infidel liberalism of the day, which might adopt as its motto the words of the sceptical poet—

"For modes of faith let graceless scalds fight,
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

But the question still recurs, Whose life is in the right? I answer, None but the believer's. No more could the hands of the clock point with precision to the figures on the dial, when the internal machinery which should regulate their motion is deranged or wanting, than can the moral movements of man be in accordance with the Divine will, when

the heart is not influenced by the moving and regulating power of right principle. To illustrate this in one of the many great points which are controverted between us:—The Church of England maintains in her Articles that a sinner is justified before God by faith alone, without works—that good works do not precede, but follow justification. The Church of Rome brands these doctrines as heretical, and asserts that good works are meritorious, and, in some measure entitle a sinner to the grace of justification. Now, to exhibit the practical influence of these doctrines, I shall suppose the case of a man having two sons, both of whom, so far as outward conduct is concerned, are equally obedient to his commands: one of them, however, conforms to his parent's will for the purpose of ingratiating himself in his favour, in order that he may inherit a larger portion of his property; or, in other words, he acts on a principle of selfishness. The other son obeys his father without any such view; he trusts his paternal tenderness for a wise and equitable distribution of his property; and he obeys his commands, not from a mercenary motive, but under the influence of a generous and filial affection to his person. Now, Sir, I ask, would not the principles respectively actuating the two sons change the whole character of their obedience in the eyes of their parent, on the supposition that those principles were open to his view? And now, to apply the illustration—Does not the Church of Rome, by teaching the sinner to regard justification and the blessings consequent upon it as *wages for work done*, necessarily place the believer in her dogmas, in reference to God, in the situation of the former son in reference to his father?—She puts him upon obeying God from a principle which must render the semblance of obedience abominable—she poisons holiness at the spring. And is it not equally plain that the Scripture doctrine of gratuitous justification supplies the only principle for the production of such disinterested, filial, and affec-

tionate obedience to the Divine commands, as can be pleasing in his sight, who, being a Spirit, requires a spiritual service—to whom all the secret springs of human action are naked and open, and who demands of his creatures, “My son, give me thine heart?”

To illustrate this subject fully, would require a book instead of a letter. However, what has been said may be sufficient to show how fallacious are the flippant assertions of modern liberalism concerning the unimportance of the *doctrines* of religion. That you, Sir, a priest of the Church of Rome, should appear to yield to the tide of popular opinion on this subject, is to me a manifest proof that Romish Ecclesiastics can assume what is most opposite to their real principles, when the interests of what they call “the Church” are likely to be promoted by such dissimulation. You, Sir, have come before the public in the garb of a *Liberal*, and yet you have sworn to receive the canons of the Council of Trent, which closes all its decrees, even on points of comparative unimportance with an “anathema sit” against the individual who dares to question the truth of its decisions. You have come before the public in the garb of a liberal; and yet you solemnly professed to believe the creed of Pope Pius, which winds up its statements of the peculiar doctrines of Popery with one sweeping clause which consigns all Protestants to hopeless perdition—“This is the true Catholic faith, out of which no man can be saved.” Your own Pope, Sir, shall censure such flagrant inconsistency. Hear how he speaks in his last Encyclical Letter, addressed to all patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops—“We now proceed,” writes his holiness, “to speak of another most fertile source of evils, with which we lament to see the church now afflicted, namely, that ‘indifferentism,’ or erroneous opinion, which, by the artifice of wicked men, has prevailed on every side; namely, that, by any profession of faith whatsoever, the eternal salvation of a soul may be obtained,

provided that the morals be good and upright." Proceeding in the same strain, his holiness roundly asserts, that, "beyond a doubt, they shall perish everlastingly, unless they hold the Catholic faith, and keep it whole and inviolate." This statement needs no comment. I shall only observe upon it, that it places you, Sir, in the unpleasant dilemma, of being constrained to acknowledge, either that you have dissembled your real sentiments, or that your opinion and the Pope's on this important subject are utterly at variance, and, therefore, that the much-vaunted unity of your church is but the dream of a dotard—a nonentity.

You complain, Sir, that calumnies have been industriously circulated in your neighbourhood, not only against your creed, but your personal character. Giving you credit for veracity in this statement, I can sympathize with you; for in my own country, Ireland, my creed is said, by Roman Catholics, to be the joint production of Luther, the Devil, and Henry the Eighth; and not unfrequently has my knowledge of the language spoken by the Roman Catholic peasantry in the West of Ireland enabled me to hear myself described not only as a wicked man, but the very Devil, in propria persona; and I believe that my brethren in the ministry will bear me out in asserting, that my experience in this is not singular. We, however, only deplore the ignorance which gives currency to such calumnies among our poor countrymen. Sometimes, indeed, our Church is described, in letters published in newspapers by Romish Bishops,* as "a mighty nuisance," as "the prolific womb whence all the evils of Ireland have teemed in fearful succession;" while we ourselves are held up to public execration, as "vultures devouring the poor man's substance with ruthless rapacity." And when these calumnies come forth from the Romish Hierarchy, in a tangible and accredited form, instead of complaining, we rejoice in the opportunity which is afforded us of vindicating ourselves, and asserting God's truth in the face of our opponents. You, Sir, it seems, possess this advantage. Some of the calumnies against your creed, as you denominate them, have been circulated in print—why then, do you not take up some of those "lying tracts" and expose the falsehoods which you say they contain? The press is open to you. An appeal to the public is afforded; you live in a Protestant country, and therefore you have not to fear an "Index expurgatorius" to consign your writings to oblivion. Your remedy is easy. He who complains of unfair usage, while he neglects to employ the means of redress which lie within his reach, has no claim on public commiseration.

I have yet to notice the most important points in your Letter. But I must defer doing so to another opportunity. For the present, I conclude; subscribing myself, in the full exercise of a charity which is quite consistent with irreconcilable abhorrence of your principles,

Your sincere well-wisher,
EDWARD NANGLE.

Bath, March 28, 1834.

* These expressions are extracted from a Letter addressed to the Bishop of Exeter, by Dr. M'Hale, Bishop of Maronia, and Coadjutor Bishop of Killala, County Mayo.

LETTER II.

TO THE REV. T. J. BROWN, &c. &c.

SIR,—I recollect once, when turning over the leaves of the "Index Expurgatorius," set forth by Papal authority, to have found among the list of prohibited books the disputation between Luther and Echius, and I was not a little amused at the *naïveté* with which his *Holiness* includes in the same condemnation, "all other publications of a similar character, in which the opinions of heretics are stated." In truth, Sir, Romanism, in the consciousness of its unsoundness, shrinks with instinctive sensitiveness from the probe of investigation; and had the Pope not betrayed this feeling in the prohibition alluded to, your letter to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, in which you have exposed yourself as writhing under the laceration inflicted on your system in the recent discussions, would furnish an illustration of its existence.

But, Sir, your letter not only betrays that dread of free inquiry which has ever influenced the upholders of Popery; it also shows the means by which they have uniformly sought to suppress it. Conscious of inability to produce such arguments as might convince the intelligent opponents of their system, they have sought to silence by the voice of authority, if not by physical force, objections which could not be solved, and arguments which could not be answered. It is in this light, Sir, that every intelligent Englishman must regard your appeal to the Bishop of Bath and Wells. Why call upon his lordship to exercise his authority in silencing those "imprudent zealots," as you denominate those clergy, who, in the fulfilment of their ordination vow, "to drive away by public and private admonition, all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's

word?"*—speak, in the honest belief of the Articles which they have subscribed, of "the Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, worshipping and adoration of relics and images, and also invocation of saints, as vain things founded upon no certain warrant of Holy Scripture"†—who denominate the mass sacrifices, which the priests of the Church of Rome pretend to offer for the living and the dead, as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,"‡ and denounce the worship of your deified wafer, as "idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians"§—why, I say, have you called upon the Bishop to silence, by the interposition of his authority, those men who are not afraid to assert principles, embodied in Articles which the Bishop, in common with themselves, has subscribed? Are the press and the not pulpit as open to the Romish Ecclesiastics as to them? Shall the Romish Bishops be permitted to denominate the Protestant Church "a mighty nuisance"—to hold up its ministers to public detestation as rapacious "kites and vultures"?¶ Shall Dr. Baines, established in a princely mansion, and furnished with abundant supplies from the Continent, hold forth such secular inducements as may entice professing Protestants to commit the education of their children to his care? Shall the same individual, openly *ex cathedra*, in the city of Bath, assail the doctrines of Protestantism, and hold forth the golden cup filled with the abominations and filthiness of Babylon's fornication, to intoxicate, to their eternal undoing, the people of Protestant England? Shall the Romish priests publicly boast of the numbers whom they have brought over to a profession of their wretched superstitions? Shall they, not satisfied with erecting chapels and colleges through the land, call upon Protestants to assist

* Ordination Service, Book of Common Prayer.

† Article 22.

‡ Article 31.

§ Rubric of Communion Service, Book of Common Prayer.

¶ Dr. M'Hale's Letter to the Bishop of Exeter.

them in building cathedrals for a more pompous and seductive display of their waver idolatry? Shall, I say, the emissaries of Romish delusion do all this, without restraint? And shall the Protestant minister, who lifts his voice in vindication of his principles, be denominated an "imprudent zealot," and shall his mouth be rudely closed by the strong hand of authority?

Regarding you, Sir, as my fellow-creature and fellow-sinner, I cannot but deplore the blindness which attaches you to the Church of Rome. Yet, for my country's sake, I must rejoice at the exposure which your letter makes of the real principles and feelings which direct the conduct of the ecclesiastics of that communion. Though Rome's branches were broken and her leaves withered, by the rough but salutary storms of the sixteenth century, the germ of all the intolerance which she ever exhibited still exists in the system, and nothing is wanted but the sun of a fair opportunity to produce its development in the establishment of such an intellectual and moral despotism, as God, in his mysterious providence, fulfilling the prophecies of the Bible, once permitted her to exercise. How actively this principle of intolerance works in your breast, Sir, is but too evident, when it impelled you, a Romish priest, so to overstep the bounds of modesty and decorum as to dictate to a Protestant Bishop the line of conduct which he should observe in the government of his diocese.

But the large portion of your letter in which you attempt to engage Episcopal authority against the "*Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation*," must not be passed unnoticed. And in the outset of my remarks upon this subject, let me remind you, that in urging the Bishop of Bath and Wells to commence active hostilities against that institution, you call upon him to pass a practical censure upon the conduct of the Archbishop and four Bishops who have enrolled themselves among its Presidents. Your first objection to this obnoxious So-

ciety is, the admissibility of Dissenters to a participation in its management and proceedings. To this I simply reply, that the members of the Establishment must deplore the schism to which you allude; but while they regret that there are questions of church government and discipline in which Churchmen differ from orthodox Dissenters, yet they rejoice that, in the great sanctifying and elevating truths of the "*Everlasting Gospel*," they fully agree, and therefore that, without any violation of conscience or compromise of principle on either side, both pious Churchmen and Dissenters may unite to repel the encroachments of a system which aims at nothing short of the utter subversion of principles equally dear and equally precious to both. But then you say, the Reformation Society interrupts the harmony which prevailed between Roman Catholics and Protestants, and it tacitly censures the parochial clergy, by implying a question as to their zeal and competence. For an answer to the former of these objections, I refer you to the words of Christ, *Matt. x. 24-29*. And I reply to the latter by denying the legitimacy of your inference. The more deeply a parochial minister is impressed with the importance of his peculiar work within the sanctuary, the more must he be sensible that the time and absorption of thought which are requisite for the due discharge of his *ordinary duties*, incapacitate him for repelling the *extraordinary assaults* which, in these days, are made by the enemy from without. If Romish Priests, relieved from the burthen of parochial ministrations, and set apart for the study of controversy, are stationed through the country, the Reformation Society may surely meet their attempt, by confronting these "*trained bands*" of the Pope, by Protestant ministers similarly circumstanced, and equally expert in the use of controversial weapons, without incurring the imputation of questioning the zeal or competency of the parochial clergy for their more private, but not less useful duties.

The last objection urged in your

letter against the Reformation Society can scarcely be read without a smile, when the quarter whence it comes is considered. It has, you say, "by provoking a spirit of inquiry, been the unwilling occasion, under God, of many conversions to the Catholic faith." This statement, Sir, places you in a dilemma from which you will find it difficult to extricate yourself, without confessing yourself to be miserably deficient either in charity or candour. Did your conscience, Sir, bear witness that truth directed your pen in inditing the sentence of your letter which I have quoted? If you reply in the affirmative, I must remind you that, in subscribing Pope Pius' creed, you solemnly swore "that out of the true Catholic faith none can be saved." Yet you exhibit a most restless anxiety for the annihilation of a Society which, in the same letter you say, has proved the instrument of many conversions to that faith. The only way, Sir, which you can elude the imputation of a reckless uncharitableness as to the eternal welfare of your fellow-men, is by admitting that the statement referred to was made, not in the unconsciousness of its truth, but in the petulance of an angry disputant; and thus your reputation for *charity* can only be preserved by the abandonment of your pretensions to *candour*.

But I must pass on from this brief notice of the insolent and domineering spirit of Popery which impelled you to prescribe rules for the guidance of a Protestant Bishop, to animadvert upon the intolerance betrayed in the *threat* with which you enforce them. "What is likely," you write, "to be the consequence of a continuance by your clergy of such wicked aggression as I have above described, upon the religious belief and practice of Catholics, your lordship's acute judgment will easily foresee. Is this, my lord, a time for your Church to add to its active enemies?" Translate this, Sir, into plain English, and it reads thus: "The Emancipation Bill has given much political power to Roman Catholics. The Established Church has many enemies,

who will join with us in effecting its overthrow. Beware, therefore, of exasperating us—soothe us—flatter us—never presume to utter, or suffer your clergy to utter, the statements embodied in your XXXIX Articles concerning Popery, to which you have assented with all the solemnity of an oath. If you do, we will rise up as one man against you, and deprive you of your palace and your revenues. Your temporal dignity and emoluments can only be retained by sacrificing to our intolerance what you believe to be the truth of God." Truly, Sir, such a menace as this, is not less dishonourable to yourself and the body with which you are connected, than it is insulting to the individual to whom it is addressed. What, Sir, are you not ashamed to avow, in the face of the British Empire, that Roman Catholics may be bribed into a friendly neutrality towards the Establishment, by a hollow semblance of indifference on the part of its members to principles, which, if they have been sincere in their most solemn professions, they must regard with unchanging abhorrence! And think you that the rapid compliment of "*acute intellect*," bestowed upon the Bishop, in an address which would insult the understanding of a well-taught Protestant child, can compensate for the deep affront couched in the supposition, that his lordship is so utterly destitute of all those high and holy principles of action which should actuate a Christian Bishop, that his conduct in the discharge of his episcopal duties may be influenced by the mere shadow of a remote prospect of temporal loss?

I feel assured, Sir, that it is in this light your threat will be viewed; indeed, it cannot be viewed in any other. It will also speak trumpet-tongued to the people of England; it will show them that the spirit of intolerance is so rampant in the system of Popery, that it impels its teachers to outrun the opportunity of its actual exercise. In my own country Priest Hughes, of Newport, was not ashamed to avow, before a bench of magistrates, that he advised

his congregation, that if any person went into their villages or houses to talk to them about religion, to put them out with pitchforks! to hunt the dogs after them, and to PUT THEM UNDER WATER FOR SO MANY MINUTES! Priest Brown, in the midst of Protestant England, quite in the Spirit of his Hibernian brother, without his brutal ferocity, dares to threaten a Protestant Bishop, in the event of his refusing to succumb to his admonitions. Surely nothing short of the re-acting of the bloody tragedies of the Inquisition could exhibit more plainly than do such facts as these, the encroaching, domineering, and intolerant spirit of Popery. If the Protestants of England are not blind to their own interests, they will ponder these things, with a view to the timely application of the rule, "principis obsta;" "for if these things be done in the green tree, what will be done in the dry?"

I cannot conclude this letter without assuring you of the total insufficiency of such base and unhallowed suggestions as you have thrown out to the Bishop, to influence the conduct of the believer, in whose heart the preciousness of God's truth is felt, and Popery as opposed to that truth is abhorred—who regards as his reconciled Father that glorious Jehovah who exercises an invisible restraint over the wild fury of his enemies, making the wrath of man to fulfil his purposes; and who says to his own people, "Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness; the people in whose heart is my law; fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their reviling; for the moth shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool; but my righteousness shall be for ever; and my salvation, from generation to generation." Isaiah, li. 7. 8.

Fervently praying that you, Sir, may be led to participate in these and all the exceeding great and precious promises of the Gospel, through faith in Christ Jesus, I again subscribe myself, your sincere well-wisher,

EDWARD NANGLE.

April 1, 1834.

AN ADDRESS TO THE KING.

The following Address to his Majesty has been sent round amongst the Clergy, during the course of the past month, and has received the signatures of many dignified and influential Clergymen:—

"TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

"We the undersigned Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy, of the Irish Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland, dutifully crave permission to approach your Majesty, with a declaration of our deliberate, unshaken, and cordial attachment to the Polity, the Doctrine, and the Worship of the Church, as by law established.

Admitted, as we have been, to the Ministry of that Church, on the faith of our avowed adherence to its principles and institutions, such a declaration on our part might be deemed superfluous, in ordinary seasons.

"But the times in which our lot is cast, are not of an ordinary character. We trust, therefore, that it will not be deemed unbecoming in us, if, actuated solely by a sense of duty, we openly make known our sentiments, hoping that we may thereby contribute, under the Divine blessing, to check the prevailing fondness for innovation, to give mutual encouragement and support to each other, and to remove that disquietude and distrust, which have been produced by the apprehension of ill-advised changes, in the minds of those who are committed to our spiritual care.

"We conscientiously believe that the polity of our Church is modelled as closely as diversity of circumstances will permit, on the platform of the Ecclesiastical Institution founded by our Lord's Apostles, and transmitted to us by their successors; that the system of our doctrine, embodies the "faith once delivered unto the Saints;" and that our form of worship is framed after the pattern of the best remains of primitive Christianity, conveying at all times the

fundamental truths of Scripture, and not seldom in its very words.

"In a Church thus pure in doctrine and apostolical in formation, whose Liturgy is endeared by long usage to the devotional feelings of its members, and whose polity harmonizes with the institutions of the State, to which it has ever proved itself a faithful and judicious ally, we deprecate the introduction of undefined changes and experiments; and we humbly trust that no alteration will be made in the discipline and services of our Church, without the sanction and recommendation of its spiritual guardians.

"Should, however, abuses be found to exist in our Ecclesiastical Establishment, we profess our readiness to co-operate for their removal.

"But we humbly submit to your Majesty, in the language of the Preface to our Book of Common Prayer, that 'experience sheweth, that where a change hath been made of things advisedly established, no evident necessity so requiring, sundry inconveniences have thereupon ensued, and those more and greater than the evils that were intended to be remedied by such a change.'

"That, accordingly, it is wiser to submit to small and questionable inconvenience, than, by impatiently attempting its removal, to expose ourselves to the risk of great and undoubted evil.

"That a general agreement as to the things requiring correction, the nature and extent of such correction, and the mode of applying it, may reasonably be demanded from the person desirous of change, as an indispensable preliminary to the concurrence of others with their views.

"That an opening once made for innovation gives occasion to alterations, not limited to the particulars which were supposed to stand in need of redress, but indefinitely extended to others, which were previously esteemed to be free from all objection.

"And that thus incalculable danger, arising from comparatively small beginnings, may accrue to our apostolical form of polity, and to the

purity of the Christian doctrine incorporated in our Public Services.

"All which we dutifully submit," &c.

REGIUM DONUM.—The Regium Donum was granted to the Presbyterian ministers of Ireland by William III. in an order dated Hillsborough, June 19, 1690, and amounted in the first instance to £1,200. In the reign of George I. the sum of £800 was added to the fund. In 1784 it was increased to £2,200. In 1792, £5,000 was charged on the civil list, to be annually paid to the Presbyterian ministers. In 1804 commenced the system of parliamentary grants. The first grant amounted to £4,160, and has been gradually augmented until 1881, when £14,800 was voted. In 1881, the Presbyterian congregations were divided into three classes, and their ministers, as they stood in the first, second, or third class, received respectively £108, £75, £50 per annum. The total amount that has been paid in annual grants from the civil list, or parliamentary votes, is more than £75,000.—*Belfast News Letter*.

THE GRASPING CHARACTER OF THE ROMISH PRIESTHOOD.

Our readers will long remember the astounding calculations and disclosures which we have at various times submitted to them, respecting the prodigious and incredible gains of the Popish Priests. Remembrance Masses alone bring the priests of Galway £15,000 a-year. Dispensations for Marriages and spiritual consanguinities yield the Bishop of Tuam £8,000 a-year; and all the many other articles of priestly merchandize produce vast and enormous sums in proportion. Avarice is the pervading spirit of every institution, every rite, and every cherished superstition of priestcraft. Not one thing will the priests countenance but what brings them money; and any thing that *will* yield it, no matter how mean or irrational, or degrading in itself, has their ready and zealous support. Even the common chari-

ties of life are tolerable in their eyes only as sources of addition to their wealth. They feed on the poverty of the poor, and glut on the miseries of the wretched; and, like the red earth-worms of the grave yard, they fatten on the corpses of the dead; while, unlike any thing else in earth, or sea, or sky, they, at the same time, make money of the torments of departed souls. Institutions for relieving the destitute, for succouring the poor, for instructing the ignorant, for consoling the afflicted, for burying the dead, or for helping the body, soul or spirit, in life or in death, in wealth or in sorrow, in this world or the world hereafter—institutions of all sorts or for any purpose, whether charitable, religious, or non-descript, can exist under the surveillance of Romish Priests, only by heaving enormous revenues into the maw of these harpies, and by making the enriching of "their Reverence" one grand end of their existence and operations. We make this awfully heavy charge only in a spirit of true charity, and heartfelt kindness towards the *Romish people*; and as it loads the priest with an amount of guilt truly appalling, it must not be left without full and adequate proof. Our limited space permits us at present to give but a few of the more unimportant examples; and we give these to our readers only as fore-shadows of far more striking instances which we hold in reserve.

MORTUARY SOCIETIES.—These associations are voluntary, only in the sense, however, in which that word is understood among the subjects of priestly coercion; and each member, we believe, pays from sixpence to a shilling a month. The *professed* object of the Society is to bury the dead, or to pay the funeral expenses of its deceased members; but we need not add that its *real* objects are to buy masses. Twelve masses a year are purchased for the whole Society; and for every member who dies, far more money is laid out in buying a mass or masses for his soul than in paying the burial expenses of his body. Under the pretext, therefore, of burying the dead, associations

of men are formed to amass, by weekly or monthly subscriptions, sums of money which are destined, to at least three-fourths of their amount, to go into the pockets of the priests. To make sure work of a Mortuary Society, the Parish Priest is its Treasurer!

PURGATORIAN SOCIETIES.—These were formed some dozen years ago, on a very large scale in Dublin. Their sole and manifest object is to sling extra money into the Priests' coffers; though they professedly assume the flimsy garb of charity for souls tormented in Purgatory. Pretty charity! Why, if souls are suffering in Purgatory, and masses will bring them out, let the priests *say* the masses—let them *charitably* do so—and let them not be so bare-faced as to demand a penny-a-week subscription from entire associations of the living before they will begin. The money of the Purgatorian Societies is amassed by donations, and by regular weekly subscription, and the *entire* amount of it goes into the priests' pockets.

CATECHISTICAL SOCIETIES.—These are a kind of Popish Sunday Schools. Their professed object is, to teach Butler's Popish Catechism to children; but every member must, of course, pay a regular weekly subscription, and, of course, this is laid out in buying masses for the Society, and, as before, the entire money falls in due course, into the pockets of the priests. We need scarcely add, that the founders, patrons, conductors, and treasurers of these societies are the priests, who get the money.

SAVINGS' BANKS.—These institutions, so highly useful elsewhere, never thrive among a community of poor Papists, and are rather squandering banks than Savings' Banks. Parish Priests almost uniformly appoint themselves the treasurers; and they deduct so very much for Easter dues, Christmas dues, Voluntary offerings, Churching fees, Baptism fees, Remembrance masses, and for dues, fees, and priestly charges of all sorts, which can be saddled on the misfortunes, or manufactured out of the pretended religious wants of a

family, that scarcely one person has a single farthing to receive. The real object of a Popish Savings' Bank is to enable or compel a poor man to create a little capital out of his earnings for meeting the exorbitant demands, and abating the insatiable cravings of his father confessor. The poor Romanists of Galway so sadly experienced the truth of this, that little short of the terrors of anathema could induce them to renew the Savings' Banks which formerly existed in this town, and which became defunct simply from the causes we have stated.

FRANCE.

EVANGELICAL PRESS OF FRANCE.—The following information on this interesting subject is from the letter of a gentleman in France to his friend in Albany, N. America, published in the *Journal and Telegraph*:—

The evangelical press certainly gains ground. The *Semeur* was started in September, 1831, with very faint hopes that it would defray its expenses; but in a short time the circulation rose to 500 a week: and when we left Paris in October last, it was 1,000. It appears every Wednesday. Its conductors are M. Dehault de Ressenay and Dr. Holland. Its chief correspondent in the provinces is M. de Felice, Protestant minister at Bolbec, who also appears to furnish letters to some American religious publication. He is the author of the "Lettres de la Province," which, after appearing from time to time in the *Semeur*, have also been published separately. They evince considerable ability, and a turn for acute observation of life and society. At page 16 of the *Archives* you find mention made of a sermon by the same author, and he has been on other occasions before the public. M. M. Grandpierre has been for a good many years at the head of the Missionary Seminary at Paris, though a young man; but before the Revolution of 1830 he was little known to the public. On that event taking place, three new places of worship was hired and fitted up in

connection with what is called the Reformed Church. M. Grandpierre began preaching in one of the new places, viz. in the Galerie de Fer, Boulevard Italien. The situation is excellent, and M. Grandpierre having turned out a preacher of the first order, a considerable auditory has at all times attended; and it is hoped considerable impression has been produced.

The first Monday of the month is kept at Paris as elsewhere, and M. Grandpierre seldom fails to officiate. He communicates what intelligence may have arrived from their own mission in South Africa; but as that is not often enough to occupy much time, he in general gives a sketch of events, recent or otherwise, in some other mission. The matter he on such occasions brings forward is so conceived that a worldly person, who happens to be present, although the subject of missions may be new to him, may obtain some precise notions of it. On the whole I have not in any country seen such meetings so judiciously managed; and in several respects the mode of proceeding deserves imitation. The same matter is for the most part published in the *Journal des Missions*, which he puts forth on the 15th of every month. This publication (which, like the *Archives*, costs only six francs a year, sent by post to any part of France) for many years was an expense to the Missionary Society; but its circulation is now so much extended that it brings in money.

The *Feuille Religieuse* has deservedly a great circulation, especially in French Switzerland. It is mostly a weekly sermon, but occasionally there are missionary and miscellaneous articles. The religious revival proceeds well in French Switzerland, and is perceptible also in some cantons where German is spoken. As to the Société Evangelique of Geneva, and the new Theological Seminary, (concerning which you put some questions,) the latest intelligence is found at page 112 of the *Archives*. The persecutions in Switzerland, and more particularly the conduct held towards M. Gausson, who is one of

the professors of the new seminary, are, I presume, pretty well known in your part of the world. He has for some years been engaged, in connexion with the Edinburgh Bible Society, on a new version of the Scriptures into French, which is expected to excel any the public yet possesses. Part has already appeared.

Since the Revolution there has been a very great increase of circulation both of Scriptures and tracts, in Paris and the provinces. Of the Scriptures a great proportion have been sold. Every now and then there appears in this country, or French Switzerland, some original work of a religious description, or some translation from the English or German; but the editions are small. There being no tax on paper in France, a large impression can be sold very cheap; and the facilities afforded by the post are very liberal, unless to productions from beyond sea. I pay only one sou for the postage of each number of the *Feuille Religieuse* from Lausanne to this place. As to the French periodicals, the publisher arranges with the post office and you have nothing to pay. There are now in this country some cheap publications that have an immense circulation; for example, the *Journal des Connaissances Utiles*, 100,000 copies monthly. It was begun in October, 1831. The same Society, "Pour L'Emancipation Intellectuelle," has put forth the *Almanach de France*, which contains much useful information, and so far it is favourable to the cause of true religion, that it is intended to drive out those Almanacs full of astrology and superstition that had heretofore been sold to the number of 800,000 annually. The first edition of the *Almanach de France* (of at least 300,000 copies) has been exhausted. The *Almanach des bons conseils* is a religious publication, for two sous, which has existed some years with an increasing sale. It gives a reference to a text for every day of the year, and some good matter for the body of the work. It finds its way among the Catholics.

A circumstance that may make the

progress of the religious press of more moment, is that, confessedly, France has fallen very low in point of miscellaneous talent, literary and philosophical. She can now boast of few great names in any branch of knowledge. Her newspapers and other periodicals are also inferior to the British."

INDIA.

HORRIBLE SUTTEE.—(From the *Bombay Courier* of Sept. 28.)—The Rajah of Eedur, a small independent state beyond the British frontier in Guzerat, died on the afternoon of the 12th of August last, and when the event, which was for some little time concealed, became known to his household, seven of the Ranees (his wives) rushed into the apartment where the dead body lay. The mother of the present young Rajah was alone ignorant of the fact of the death, being detained in her room by the Kharbarees, or native ministers. On the morning of the 5th, the above seven Ranees, two concubines of different castes from the Rajah, one personal manservant, and four female slaves, were taken with the corpse and burnt with it, before the whole assembled population of Eedur. Every body of influence is stated to have aided in the horrid tragedy, and not a single person, either connected with the Rajah's family or otherwise, appears to have interposed a solitary effort, by word or deed, to prevent these 14 unfortunate people from taking the fatal step of burning with their chief's body. On the contrary, the greatest alacrity was shown on all sides to complete this infamous outrage. One of the Ranees was several months advanced in pregnancy; another, who had throughout shown a disinclination to sacrifice herself, had only been married 19 months to the Rajah, and was under 20 years of age. Just before the lighting of the funeral pile, the eldest Rane (60 years of age) addressed the Kharbarees, saying that "she herself had always determined to die with the Rajah, and that no expostulation

would have turned her from her purpose, but that it was strange she had not heard one word of dissuasion or compassion expressed by any one." She concluded her remarks by desiring them to go and live on the plunder they were securing to themselves by the destruction of their chief's family. The Karbarees were influenced, it is understood, in sparing the life of the surviving Ranee, as she is the mother of the late Rajah's only son, and her loss might have been injurious to their interest. An extensive pillage of the Rajah's personal property, consisting of various valuables in jewels, &c., is stated to have taken place for the benefit of the Karbarees.

ENLARGED PRIVILEGES OF THE NATIVES OF INDIA.—This is the

most glorious era in the annals of our history, and ere a few years elapse India shall be a vast scene of wonders. The prejudices that had hitherto chained the minds both of our rulers and of our countrymen, are beginning to wear off. That aversion on the part of the former for not allowing the latter the same privileges to which they say the Europeans are only entitled, has been lost in the surrounding light of civilization. I now see that many respectable offices are open to us, and I hope that my countrymen will make themselves deserving of them. I thank our rulers for what they have done; but let them not think that India is sated with their benevolence.—*Gyananeshun.*

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,

AND

Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXXIII.

JULY, 1834.

VOL. III.

ON THE ELOQUENCE OF THE IRISH PULPIT.

"I say the pulpit (in the sober use
Of its legitimate, peculiar powers)
Must stand acknowledged, while the world shall stand,
The most important and effectual guard,
Support, and ornament of virtue's cause."—COWPER.

In these times, as usually happens in intervals of peace, attention has been much turned to the study of eloquence. The human mind is a restless thing: when not employed in one direction, it will force a channel for itself in another. Though we have had, of late, no very impressive displays of forensic oratory, yet the harangues delivered from time to time, on various occasions, evince that there is much rhetorical talent in the country, and that this talent has not been uncultivated. Of this, the speeches made at the meetings of the Brunswick Club, of the Conservative and other Societies, furnish some satisfactory proofs: while it was universally admitted, that the debate in the House of Lords, the summer before last, on the reform question, reflected distinguished credit on that assembly.

In this general attention to public speaking, the pulpit has not allowed itself to be passed unnoticed. On the contrary, it has gradually arrested, and continues to arrest, the popular ear: having made an impression much more deep than the world are willing to admit. A great and effectual door has been opened to the advance of truth; and the consequence is, there are many adversaries. Yea, those who once were indifferent and supine

upon the matter, are now gnawing their tongues with vexation. The serpent's tail has been trod upon, and accordingly, he is rearing his crest in mighty wrath, the more so, as he knoweth that his time is but short.

But, through what description of preaching have these results been realized? Has it been the dull, dry, sapless address that prevailed previously to the last thirty years? Surely not. Both the doctrine, and the manner of announcing it, have been undergoing a progressive renovation.—First, a little heat of piety began to be introduced; still, without much light: it was the flax-smoking. Then, as the SPIRIT from on high blew upon this spark, the blaze waxed brighter and brighter; clearer views of divine truth were gradually developed; sermons became instinct with life and energy. On a deeper insight into, and experience of, religion on the part of its preachers, ensued, as a natural consequence, a more warm and animated delivery—the fire was caught by the auditors; and, in a goodly number of sons and daughters turned from sin and the world unto righteousness, God set his seal to his own truth, and confirmed the testimony of his messengers by moral miracles.

Amidst this blessed renovation, in which all the orthodox churches in these realms successively shared, it was to be expected that those of Ireland would not remain spell-bound. No; they, too, have awoken, and put on their beautiful garments: not only have numbers of the younger clergy given themselves devotedly to their work, but many, also, of their seniors. Almost every day brings us delightful tidings of an able and zealous pastor labouring here and there, in districts which we had no idea were thus favoured. The pulpits are, one after another, catching and holding up the marvellous light, and reflecting it around them. The churches are, indeed, as cities set upon a hill, conspicuously holding forth the word of life; so that the Gospel is communicated, as by so many signal-fires, from eminence to eminence, with increasing lustre over the land.

But different nations have their respective styles of eloquence, and this peculiarity of style naturally extends itself to the pulpit. I propose inquiring, what is the characteristic of the eloquence of the Irish pulpit?—Of eloquence there are various species: the imaginative, the argumentative, the persuasive, and the hortatory or declamatory, consisting of vivid, overpowering bursts and appeals. Perhaps the best oratory would be one in which these various species were united. Now, with respect to the Irish style, it is commonly supposed to be of the first description specified; namely, the imaginative. We occasionally hear persons loosely speaking of the *Irish style* of eloquence, which they generally do with a smile or sneer, as if it consisted merely of the froth of rhetoric. Our national style possibly acquired this character from the blaze of fancy and imagination which characterized in the speeches of Burke, Curran, and Sheridan; men, compared with whom, they who speak thus slightly of their

performances, are but dwarfs and infants. Indeed, when I hear such persons talk, I am apt to suspect (and I think it will generally be found so) that they are but dull and prosaic themselves. Irish eloquence! we burn when we hear it spoken of contemptuously.

Even admitting that imagination were its predominant feature; would this be any disparagement to it? Let him who thinks so look at the Scriptures. He who inspired that precious book knew what is in man, and of course what medium of language was best adapted for his instruction. The Scriptures, therefore, are the true standard of style. Now, what is their style? Is it not; beyond that of almost any other book in existence, imaginative? Does not the Bible teem with metaphors and figures? Is not a very considerable portion of it poetry; and poetry, too, of the highest order? Does not its Divine Author himself say, respecting the vehicle of his communications, "I have used similitudes"? Was it not our Saviour's perpetual practice—(and he spake as never man spake)—to employ parables? What frequent and beautiful similes and allusions did he employ.—And then, if we turn to the epistolary writings, especially those of St. Paul, how intensely figurative is the phraseology! while the Sacred Canon closes with a book, which, beyond any other, addresses itself to the fancy. Oh, that persons would learn to reflect, before they speak, and not betray their ignorance and folly! As Pope has rightly remarked—

"'Tis hard to say, if greater want of skill
Appear in writing, than in judging ill;
But certain 'tis, less dangerous is th' offence
To tire the patience, than mislead the sense."

Who is there, in these times, that pretends not to judge? and yet how few, comparatively, are qualified for judging! Imaginative language is not only the natural mould into which a full and ardent mind effuses itself—as might be evinced by instances innumerable—but is also the language most of all fitted to arrest attention, and to rivet itself on the memory. Let the reader but ask himself, what portions of a public address he best remembers, and, I venture to say, they will generally prove to be those which conveyed some striking image or similitude. Let us not decry imagination. It is one of these intellectual powers wherewith the All-wise has seen fit to endow us: not the *predominant* power, indeed, for man is most signalized by his reason; but still a power, and an important one too, that may be turned to vast account, especially in religion. Seeing the human mind is so exceedingly dull in comprehending spiritual things, of what moment is it, when these can be rendered, as they often have been, clear and luminous, through some apt and familiar illustration. Yea, with what additional force may even an evident and common-place truth be impressed by means of a well-chosen

figure. Such an expression frequently conveys, in a few syllables, a whole world of ideas.

Besides, what an auxiliary to faith is fancy! How may she assist the former to realize the things unseen? True, it is not the creations of fancy, but the avancements of revelation that are the proper, legitimate objects of faith; but may not the imagination help to picture forth those objects to faith's eye, so as to enable her to conceive and substantiate them in a more vivid and palpable manner, than she could do otherwise? Wisely, then, has the Most High implanted in us this faculty. It is, in its appropriate sphere, a most precious endowment; and he is to be pitied, indeed, who is entirely destitute of it: much does he lose both of benefit and enjoyment. Every power, faculty, and feeling of the soul should, in instruction, be appealed to. Man has reason, and it should be plied; emotion, and it should be plied; imagination, and it also should be plied. Accordingly, we find Scripture addressing itself to all. These are, in fact, the "hands of a man," whereby the Almighty draws us. Let us, then, beware how we despise them.

* Οὐκ ὅπως ἀποβλήτα θεῶν ἐρικυδέα ἔσρα.

I have been defending Irish eloquence from the imputation commonly cast upon it, of being merely imaginative—taking it for admitted that this was actually its distinctive character: I am now prepared to show, however, that such is by no means the case. The Irish, indisputably, are gifted with much imagination: but yet, this endowment is not peculiar to them. If we may judge from the mental products of England and Scotland, our neighbours possess it in a still greater degree. The two noblest poets of modern times, Shakspeare and Milton, were Englishmen; and that country has subsequently produced numerous imaginative writers—a hundred to the one that Ireland has. And if from secular, we turn to sacred authors, where will we find preachers whose compositions are more richly imbued with imagery than a Chalmers, or a Robert Hall—the one a North-Briton, the other a South? Nay, if we ascend to the days of the Second Charles, and peruse the writings of those ministers, two thousand of whom left the Church of England; and draw virtue out of her to a degree that she has never yet recovered, such as Howe, and Owen, and Flavel, particularly the last, we shall find that they abound with beautiful illustrations and similes, which constitute, indeed, in a great measure, their uncommon charm. Look, again, to the productions of many of our old English bishops—bishops who flourished during the time of which good King George III. felicitously remarked, "there were giants on the earth in those days;"—look at the names of those stupendous men, Hall, Reynolds, and Taylor, for example; and how pregnant are they with fancy! Take an instance from the last-mentioned prelate, who, from his highly poetical style, has received the appellation of the Shakspeare of divines; and the

passage occurs in his Sermon on Prayer: "He that prays to God with an angry, that is, with a troubled and discomposed spirit, is like him that retires into a barrel to meditate, and sets up his closet in the out-quarters of an army, and chooses a frontier garrison to be wise in. Anger is a perfect alienation of the mind from prayer; and, therefore, is contrary to that attention which presents our prayers in a right line to God. For so have I seen a lark rising from his bed of grass, and soaring upwards, singing as he rises, and hopes to get to heaven, and climb above the clouds; but the poor bird was beaten back with the loud sighings of an eastern wind, and his motion made irregular and inconstant, descending more at every breath of the tempest than it could recover by the libration and frequent weighing of its wings; till the little creature was forced to sit down and pant, and stay till the storm was over; and then it made a prosperous flight, and did rise and sing as if it had learned music and notation from an angel, as he passed sometimes through the air, about his ministrations here below: so is the prayer of a good man; when his affairs have required business, and his business was matter of discipline, and his discipline was to pass upon a sinning person, or had a design of charity, his duty met with infirmities of a man, and anger was its instrument, and the instrument became stronger than the prime agent, and raised a tempest, and overruled the man, and then his prayer was broken, and his thoughts were troubled, and his words went up towards a cloud, and his thoughts pulled them back again, and made them without intention; and the good man sighs for his infirmity, but must be content to lose the prayer, and he must recover it when his anger is removed, and his spirit is becalmed, made even as the brow of Jesus, and smooth like the heart of God; and then it ascends to heaven upon the wings of the holy dove, and dwells with God, till it returns, like the useful bee, laden with a blessing and the dew of heaven."—I wonder if this be not fancy and poetry! From the fore-mentioned instances, then, it will sufficiently appear, that whatever is, imagination is *not* the characteristic of the Irish style of pulpit eloquence. What, then, may that characteristic be? I should say, *feeling* and *ferocity*. Feeling is the very soul of a genuine Irish sermon. It is not deficient (far from it) in imagery: it is not deficient (far from it) in reasonings; instances might be produced in abundance, from Archbishop Dubois to Archbishop Magee, and from numerous living ministers, whose delicacy prevents me naming, to prove that Irishmen are as capable as any other men of wielding the sword of argument, and of grappling with an antagonist in the arena of controversy. But yet, that which is pre-eminently obvious and distinctive in an Irish preacher, is, if I mistake not, *simplicity* and *ferocity*. Like Elihu, he is "full of matter; the spirit within him constraineth him." He throws himself, heart and soul into his subject: he is borne along by a divine enthusiasm; there is no more of his, that irresistibly arrests

attention, and chains the auditor to the spot, however unwelcome the doctrine may occasionally be. In a regular Irish sermon there are the usual ingredients of a Gospel discourse—exposition of the text; statement of some doctrine founded thereupon; arguments to confirm, or illustrations to elucidate, that doctrine; and a close, practical application of the whole: interspersed, withal, with much striking and original thought, and splendor of imagery. These, however, might all exist, and yet, if the subject were not fully felt, but delivered in a cold, unimpassioned, heartless manner, comparatively no impression would be produced. But herein lies the excellence of Hibernian preaching, that these constituents form but the materials of the lava stream; the whole being melted and fused into a glowing mass, by the intensity of feeling that burns within the preacher's bosom. A person may be a burning, without being a shining light; and again, the reverse of this may occur; there may be "zeal" unattended with "knowledge;" but the truly Irish pastor I think peculiarly fitted to combine these two advantages, to be both "a burning and a shining light." And hence, it has been remarked, that were the Irish once converted, they would make the finest missionaries in the world. For, as personal religion is ever more or less tinged and modified by the constitutional temperament and disposition of its subject, as was exemplified by the Apostles themselves, so it is to be expected, that with a people, naturally possessed of such uncommon warmth of feeling and character, as the Irish confessedly are, their religious affections would be proportionably ardent; while their natural fickleness and instability of purpose would be corrected and compensated by the weight and solidity which true piety invariably brings along with it. Their "hearts would be established by grace."

No doubt the above description is to be taken with a certain limitation. I have stated what I conceive to be the case of a *genuine* Irish evangelical sermon. Of course there are exceptions. Nor are the foregoing delineations applicable to Irish preachers exclusively.—As there be many, alas! too many in Ireland, of whom my description does not hold true; so are there (thanks be to God) numbers, both in England and Scotland, of whom it does. In neither land are all the natives the exact images and counterparts of each other; but there is a general moral as well as physical conformation marking the country.

Now, it may be expected here that I address some specimens, or quotations, illustrative and confirmatory of what I have advanced. This, however, is by no means an easy matter; and for very obvious reasons. In the first place, few Irish sermons are published. Whether it be that the thing is not customary in this country, or that the clergy are too indolent, or too busy in other matters, or too modest; or that there is not sufficient encouragement given to works brought out in Ireland, or all events, such is the fact, that Ireland, when compared with her

sister island, is not illustrious for authorship. But again, most of the discourses of the character I have been describing are extemporaneous, and never committed to paper at all. And, lastly, even in the case of printed sermons, it is a trite but true remark, how much the most impressive and spirit-stirring address loses of its impressiveness, when coolly perused. All the united effect of look, and voice, and gesture, and action, on the preacher's part, and all the kindled sympathy and excitement on the hearers', have evaporated and are vanished. In truth, between a sermon preached and a sermon read, there is nearly as much difference as between the living and the dead. The body, indeed, is there, but the feeling and fire that gave it soul and animation are no more. "*Hec, quantum mutatus!*"

Nevertheless, even in the face of so manifest a disadvantage, I venture to adduce (they are all that my limits will allow of) three or four extracts. The first is from a sermon by the late Rev. D. Charles Wolfe, on the text, "God created man in his own image."

"Measure now this creature with himself—the wonderful powers of his mind, the grasp of his memory, the lightning of his invention, with the depravity which is withheld from the beasts of the field; the impurity which brings his soul into bondage to his body; the malice and revenge that make him the abode of the spirit of darkness. Truly the wild beasts are in our ruins, and the dragons are in our pleasant places. These are the fragments of an image that once was beautiful enough to show that it once existed, and that now it is broken. And among the ruins there is a voice sometimes heard, like the spirit of a departed inhabitant, unwilling to leave even the ruins of the palace which he once had occupied; a voice that reasons of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come; that sometimes catches the ear in the momentary stillness of the day, and still more in the dead of night, before deep sleep falleth upon men; but, like the murmurs of a ghost, men cannot bear to listen to it. And thus does conscience sometimes remind us of former days—of hours of sin—of time squandered away, that can never be recovered—of an impure heart and a worldly and carnal mind, and proves that it is a remnant of God; for it tells us that for all these things God will bring us into judgment. But, alas! it does no more than reproach and condemn; for, alas! it cannot change an old heart; it cannot create a new spirit within us; it cannot raise our affections from the dust upon which we are treading; it cannot fill us with heavenly dispositions; it cannot make us look forward with delight to scenes of future glory. Alas! this is beyond the power of conscience. It serves to reproach, but cannot restore; it is but a ghost among the ruins—~~but~~ a voice among the tombs; it is a poor remnant of what was once a living temple of the Almighty—enough to show that it once existed, and that it is now broken!"

'Who that peruses the writings of this most interesting man (whose lines on the death of Sir John Moore are alone sufficient

to immortalize their author) can help being struck with admiration at the united elegance of taste, elevation of mind, earnestness of piety, and, above all, singular self-renouncement and philanthropy of his character? Who can help regretting that one so eminently gifted by nature, and endowed by grace, and thus calculated to prove at once a blessing to his country and an ornament to his species, was so soon ordained to realize

"The doom Heaven gives its favourites, early death?"

Our loss, however, is his gain. His toils and trials have ceased for ever; and if his sweet lyre be heard no longer on earth, in heaven his golden harp unites its numbers with the choir of the seraphim!

My next extract shall be from a sermon by the Rev. N. Armstrong; preached on behalf of the British Reformation Society, on the text, "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up."

"Zeal in religious matters is much to be commended. Zeal is commendable *when it is manifested for important or necessary things*. But what is so important as that God should be known—as that men should be saved? What is so necessary as that the house, the palace, the temple of the living God, should be built—as that the influence of Satan should be broken—as that sin and misery should be removed from the earth? What so necessary as that heaven's light should be introduced into men's heads, and heaven's warmth into men's hearts, and heaven's happiness into men's spirits? It is the business of Christianity to do all this; and, therefore, the man who shall not be zealous in this behalf is either ignorant and uninstructed, as far as his judgment is concerned, or he is a man who is cold, and insensible, and stupid, as far as his heart is concerned.

"Zeal is commendable, also, *if you have a short time to do any thing in*. If you have a long time in which to do it, and can overtake the work, as we say, you need not be so zealous; but if hell kindle under your feet while I speak; if heaven be open to receive you while I speak; if Christ Jesus hang upon the cross before you while I speak; if angels are prepared to sweep their harps with joy over your repentance while I speak; if these things are so important, and if the time you have to do it be so very short; if you have but a moment to become acquainted with Christ; if you have but a moment to receive the Holy Spirit into your heart; if you have but a moment in which to know God, the knowledge of whom is eternal life; if you have but a moment to escape hell and to gain heaven—to have your eternal destiny brightened, and to have the darkness of despair removed from your prospects for ever; if there is but a moment for all this to be done, the earnestness with which men ought to set about the work no language can describe.

"But, lastly, if you and I would ask the prophets who are in heaven, the apostles, the martyrs, the confessors, who meditated on their sermons in the dungeon's gloom, and preached them by

the faggot's light—could we ask these, who laboured for Christ, if they have regretted all the zeal with which they were animated by the Holy Spirit?—if we ask Moses, do you regret all the zeal that glowed in your bosom?—if we ask Paul, do you regret your zeal for Christ?—if we ask Peter and John the same question, they all of them answer, with one voice, Our zeal was due to God; it was his spirit produced it, it was union with his, Son which fed it and kept it alive: we do not regret it. If a tear can fill the eyelid of an inhabitant of heaven, it shall flow from this—we had not zeal enough: warm and bright as our zeal was, it was damp and cold compared with the gratitude and the love that is manifested unto us. Oh, my brethren, is your zeal an eating zeal? God's religion is a consuming religion. The man in whom God's religion is, may be worn by the religion that is in him, as the scabbard is worn by the sharp sword. Just as the wick is worn by the oil and the flame—as the banks of the river are worn by the rapid stream that rushes along—so may the man be consumed by true religion."

In considering the eloquence of the Irish Pulpit, it were improper to pass unnoticed two distinguished individuals, now no more—KIRWAN and MATURIN. The former of these was originally a Romish priest; but having afterwards embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, he became a minister of the Establishment, and was promoted for his talents to a deanery. For him was reserved the high honour of being (as has been observed) "the first to awaken the slumber of the Irish pulpit;" and the powerful, unprecedented impressions produced through his preaching, have not been forgotten to this day, nor been surpassed by any subsequent appeals. His printed discourses gave (as usual) some disappointment; yet the following extracts will be admitted to vindicate for him the claim to no common abilities.

A DEATH-BED.

"All, all is well as long as the curtain is up, and the puppet-show of life goes on; but when the rapid representation comes to a close, and every hope of a longer respite is precluded, let them believe me, that things will appear in a very different light. A death-bed is a wonderful reasoner; many a proud infidel, bath it humbled and refuted, without a word, who, but a short time before, would have defied all the ability of man to shake the foundation of his system. Would to God I could say that that great and awful moment were as often distinguished by the dew of repentance as by the groan of despair."

THE DELUDING INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD.

"My brethren, the true source of all our delusion is a false and deceitful security of life. Thousands pass their accounts around us, and we are not instructed. Some are struck in our very arms—our parents, our children, our friends—and yet we stand as if

we had shot into the earth an eternal root. Even the most sudden transitions from life to dust produce but a momentary impression on the dust that breathes. No examples, however awful, sink into the heart. Every instant we see health, youth, beauty, titles, reputation, and fortune, disappear like a flash. Still do we pass gaily on in the broad and flowery way, the same busy, thoughtless, and irreclaimable beings, panting for every pleasure as before; thirsting for riches and pre-eminence; rushing on the melancholy ruins of one another; intriguing for the employments of those whose ashes are scarce cold; nay often, I fear, keeping an eye on the very expiring, with the infamous view of seizing the earliest moment to solicit their spoils."

ON INFIDELITY.

"But to reject truths of the strongest evidence, merely for the glory of rejecting them; to reject without inquiry, a system, which, like a rock in the midst of the deep, has stood the beat of all tempests and torrent of ages; or to use no other arms against it but a set of common-place worn-out difficulties, that tremble from old age and caducity, a thousand times advanced, and a thousand times refuted; not to be able to support the infidelity they adopt, or prove the falsehood of the faith they abjure; and in this state of shameful inconsistency, yet pretended conviction, gaily and proudly to advance on a tremendous eternity!—if such be the mark of superior understanding, or even of common sense, then I wish to be informed what it is that constitutes embeccility or frenzy? My friends, the great source of infidelity is not in the understanding of man, it is in the pride and corruption of his heart. Well has the prophet compared the impious man to a tempestuous sea, which, tormented by the winds, vomits upon its shore a tide of slime and impurity. Be not surprised at the boldness of the metaphor; it is exactly applicable to those geniuses who make the sacred objects of our belief the butt of their ridicule and scorn. This is not an occasion on which I can collect and display the proofs that support revelation; but show me a man, whose moral character evinces that he has no interest in decrying them, who, perfectly divested of pride, prejudice, and passion, will carefully examine them; will trace, and when he has traced them, will candidly acknowledge the exact and most literal accomplishment of the Scripture prophecies, that invincible stumbling-block in the way of all objectors to Christianity; will admit that its original establishment, in the face of all human opposition, is any evidence of divine original; that certitude, moral and historical, and facts the most palpable, are a test of truth in any cause whatsoever; that the assent of the most virtuous and enlightened men in every age of the Christian world, down to the present hour, carries any weight with it; that our religion, if false, could have still kept its ground in so many nations of the earth, amidst the increase of human knowledge, and unceasing variation of all human things; and after such an inquiry, and such

acknowledgements, will still persist in unbelieving, I will then confess that real and deliberate incredulity is not a chimera."

The other name is that of the late Rev. C. R. Maturin, a name of deep and enduring interest, concerning whom it is much to be regretted that his high gifts were not uniformly laid on the altar of the Giver, and consecrated exclusively to the advancement of that religion; of which he was calculated to be so bright and so able an advocate. His five sermons on the errors of the Roman Catholic Church have been considered masterpieces. They attracted, in the course of their delivery, extraordinary crowds, and derive an additional and melancholy interest from the fact of their being (as I believe) the last sermons that man of eloquence and genius ever composed. The following are extracts from the concluding discourse:—

"I have done with her doctrines (for the present at least), and I hasten to exhibit to you three distinct portraits of Papal Rome; what she *was* in the days of the plenitude of power; what she *is* in her present day of humiliation and decline; and what she *yet must be*, when the full counsel of God against her is accomplished, and heaven and earth shall exclaim, in the language of my text, 'The hour of His judgment is come; Babylon is fallen, is fallen.' It is not four hundred years since her power exceeded all that was ever known by the name of power on earth. The sway of the most extensive conqueror, the despotism of the most absolute tyrant, were but bands of straw, compared with the chain of adamant in which she bound the bodies and the souls of men. There was not a nation in Europe where she had not deposed or created a sovereign. She stood a Colossus, one foot planted in the centre of the visible globe, and the other in the shadowy regions of futurity; mistress confessed of both worlds; and all Europe, from OrCADES to Calpe, from the western extremity of Ireland to the confines of Russia, bowed before her and worshipped. Europe!—what do I say? From Paraguay to China—from Labrador to Lapland, she claimed all power, and possessed all she claimed. So she sat in the palace and seat of the Cæsars, her foot on the necks of kings, and here triple crown mingling with the stars of heaven. Nor was her opulence less than her power; ever ship that traversed the seas brought her wealth; every horn that sounded at the gates of the seven-hilled city announced homage; every breeze that blew beneath the canopy of heaven, fanned the standard of the triple crown; and wherever that standard waved, it waved triumphant. Such, not more than four hundred years ago, was the Church of Rome in her day of greatness, glory, and crime. What is she now? The same—the same, cry her adherents; the same in spirit, if not in power. That she is the same in spirit, I readily acknowledge, and bitterly lament; but can the most desperate and blinded bigot close his eyes against the obvious and increasing decline of her power. She was, indeed, a proud and glorious gallej, the burden and the terror of the great deep; but she lies on its waters now a diarmasted hulk; her pendant sweeps

the seas no more; the strong blast of the Reformation hath rent away mast and mainsail, rope and rudder; the mighty rushing winds of heaven are abroad, and assail her from every point of the compass; England, Scotland, all the north, and half the east of Europe, hold her in chase, and every shot they send through her rotten timbers threatens to make her a wreck. On she drives before the storm and the foe, while her mariners, with desperate infatuation, run up and down her decks, crying, 'All's well! all's well!—we hold the true course; we are certain of the port; till she strikes! she strikes! and she, her mariners, and her passengers go down together for ever!

"Imagine the horrors of an *interdict* which Popery, in its day of power, laid on the country whose sovereign had happened to offend. The churches were shut; the elements mouldered on the altar; the priests fled the churches; from the bridegroom dropt the hand of the bride; the mourner left the body unwept—the corpse rotted on the highway unburied; the mother viewed with horror her new-born babe, never to be named by the name of a Christian; and the child shrunk from its parent placed beyond the pale of salvation, and excluded from the rites of the church. Roman Catholics of Ireland, would ye wish—could ye bear the renewal of these horrors? Ye would spurn at the usurped and daring authority that would deprive you alike of the blessings of religion and the benefits of civilization. If Rome, in evil hour, presumed to assert her former power over you, ye would quit yourselves like men, and repel it—repel it as ye valued the property ye have toiled for, the wives ye have wedded, the children ye have begotten, the land ye love and live in, and above all, the memories ye must leave behind you. In addressing you thus, I forget the odious names of party distinction; I care not what ye denominate yourselves. If ye are Irishmen—if ye are *men*—if the baptism of humanity, in which God bathed your brows at your very birth, be not effaced by the searing finger of bigotry—if ye have one honest, manly, natural feeling in your hearts, ye would exclaim, 'We will not have this man to reign over us.' Oh! my brethren, first in valour and genius among the nations of Europe, will you be the last in the mighty march of mind towards intellectual liberty? Shall history exult over the records of every other nation, and blush and weep only over *yours*? And when she writes, in characters that shall live for ever, the names of patriots and heroes—add to yours, they *might have been so*, but they were the dupes of priestcraft and bigotry. I am reasoning with you from your own convictions; and as the Apostle said to the intelligent, but sceptic sovereign, 'King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest.' Oh! would to God that even one voice would answer, 'Almost thou persuadest me to be' what I would wish to be—if I dare."

These extracts are, I trust, sufficient to illustrate and establish what has been advanced respecting the Irish pulpit. In concluding this paper, I submit a few remarks to two classes of

persons—those who propose entering the Christian ministry, or who have but recently entered it; and those who have the privilege of sitting under such a ministry.

I. It may not seem unsuitable here to offer, in the spirit of humility and affection, a few familiar suggestions relative to the ministrations of that solemn place.

First, then, I would say, that none can be eloquent, in the highest sense of the term, but such as have felt the truth in their hearts.* Persons may be splendidly endowed with the powers of mind and command of language; they may have ever so clear a comprehension of the scheme of salvation, and be able to converse volubly and instructively upon it; yet, unless their knowledge be experimental—unless they have inwardly *tasted* the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come—unless they can, in a spiritual sense, say with the Apostle, “That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of Life, declare we unto you,”—all their oratory will be feeble and frigid; or, if there be any fire at all, it will be false and constrained. It is when a man *feels* what he delivers; when he has first preached the sermon to himself; when he has come fresh from the mount of meditation and the communion of the closet; when he has been realizing the things of the eternal world, and got his lips touched with a live coal from off the altar, and his heart warmed with the Saviour’s love, and zeal for the Saviour’s glory, and he contemplates his audience as so many souls that must be converted to God, or else perish everlastingly,—it is then that he will speak in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power; then that he will preach from the heart to the heart; then that he will fling forth his appeal, like a mass of fire, among his people, to warm and impress, and, under God, purify and renew their spirits. Could Dr. Chalmers, with all his natural abilities, transcendent as they are, pour forth those vivid bursts, that so astonish and electrify his hearers, were it not for his piety? No; I venture to say it would be impossible. There is a spirit in them that is not to be feigned. Deep-seated religion lies at the very bottom of his powers, and, like the heat of a hotbed, gives vigour and vitality to his happiest effusions. Let piety, then, be the prime thing cultivated—cultivated, indeed, not as a stepping-stone to eloquence (that were a most unhallowed ambition), but for its own sake, and utility’s sake. A minister is never so truly eloquent as when, totally forgetting himself and having a single eye to the glory of God and the salvation of men, he throws himself, heart and soul, into his discourse, and labours, to the utmost

* We suppose the author does not mean to infer that all the preachers from whose sermons he has quoted, felt the TRUTH in their hearts. One, we believe, when awakened to behold and appreciate the TRUTH at a late hour of life, acknowledged that heretofore he had been BUT AN ACTOR.—ED.

of his might, to pull sinners out of the territory of destruction into the sanctuary of Messiah's kingdom.

2. Let the preacher be always on the search for materials. It is the great deficiency of young ministers especially that they want furniture. There is plenty of steam, plenty of wind, and their sails and colours are spread forth gloriously; but they lack ballast and freight. Even the most talented and learned preacher will not be long able to maintain his ground in his people's estimation, if he fail continually to recruit his resources by reading and contemplation. "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." The business requires study. Never was a learned ministry more necessary than at present: for, in the first place, never were the adversaries of the truth more daring, if so daring. They have ceased to act on the defensive; they now carry the war into "the camps of the saints." Again, never was the human mind so much awake. Intelligence is spread, and spreading amazingly. A thirst for information is universally diffused; and books, especially on theology, are, by the serious portion of the community, perused with an increasing eagerness. Thus, then, if the ministry do not read likewise, so as to keep pace at least with the laity, will it not ensue that the ungodly will gain the victory over them in argument, and that the people shall have more understanding than their teachers, and be tempted to despise them?

But especially must the divine be diligent in "searching the Scriptures." They are the vantage ground from which he ought never to descend; his credentials as an ambassador from heaven to earth; the armoury and magazine from which, pre-eminently, he must draw the weapons of his warfare; the directory both of his own conduct and that of his hearers; and the sum and substance of his message. What is recorded of Apollos should be the aim of every Christian herald, namely, that he was "an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures."

The preacher should have no "*favourite doctrine*." Some allow the subject of the Millennium, for example, so to run away with them, that they can hardly speak of any thing else. Let them commence with what topic they may, they invariably glide into this; thus allowing the Millennium to usurp the place of Christ, the sun to whom all the rays of doctrine should converge—the focus wherein they should all centre. In short, preachers should endeavour to give every doctrine and duty that place and prominence in their instructions which the Scriptures assign them. They should study also the *style* of Scripture, the model of all styles, as chosen by infallible Wisdom. It seems not unlikely, that as the church advances in grace and knowledge, preaching will gradually approximate to the spirit and manner of the Bible; in which event there will, of course, be less of peculiarity in any one style of national sermonizing.

But while you make the oracles of heaven your main resource, the staple and marrow of your theology, you must not be negli-

gent of drawing knowledge from other sources that may be rendered subsidiary to this. Much wisdom, that may prove of service, may be gathered from almost every sight and circumstance. Truths lie scattered around us as plentifully as was the manna on the ground of the desert, had we only the eyes to descry them. The volume of Creation may illustrate the volume of Revelation. As has been remarked, "the world's a system of theology." It ought to be the preacher's aim to place old truths in new and striking positions, and thereby to bring them home to the head and heart with all the raciness of novelty. To this end, let him be ever on the watch for elegant and appropriate illustrations and similes, which to a sanctified fancy, will be suggested, more or less, by nearly all we see or hear. "*Condo, at compono, quæ moræ depromere possum.*"

3. The preacher should habituate himself to *meditation*. It is from want of this habit that the minds of some are so lean, and their discourses so dry and meagre. The more you meditate, the more will "your heart be inditing," or, as it is in the margin, "bubbling up with good matter." Meditation on Scripture will give your sermons weight and richness. Meditation on the world will enable you to detect and expose its emptiness. Meditation on your own heart will give you a mastery over the hearts of others. Meditation on "the terrors of the Lord" on the one side, and on the felicities of his kingdom on the other, will render you, if any thing will, earnest in beseeching men to flee from the former, and lay hold on the latter. A spiritual mind and much intercourse with the invisible world will add even to Irish preaching a forcibleness and fervour which all the warmth of mere natural emotion can ever attain to.

4. A preacher should strive to be *judicious*. Correct taste and good common sense are most essential ingredients in a good sermon. Here, perhaps, it is that our national preaching is chiefly defective. Either there is an ill selection of materials, or expressions are used too strong and uncooth, or else calculated to cause unnecessary offence, or, it may be, ridicule. Perhaps, also, the sermon is not unfrequently *too long*. As a general rule, Mr. Wesley's opinion seems a good one: that no sermon ought to be longer than half an hour. Many preachers continue hewing with the sword of the Spirit until they blunt it. It demands as much consideration to determine what shall be left out of a sermon, as what to insert. All superfluous matter should be rejected. All that does not strengthen, weakens. Moreover, all needless and pedantic criticisms on the authorized text—these, besides being commonly uninteresting and unimportant, have a tendency to loosen men's confidence in Scripture. Let us remember that our translators were persons of no ordinary erudition, piety, and wisdom, and that they took the greatest possible pains in their work. The preacher should not lose time in tedious perorations, but plunge at once into the subject. Whatever he says should be to the purpose. Neither should he rest in mere generalities; particulars

touch—generalities seldom, if ever. “Do not spend your sermons,” says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, “in general and indefinite things, as in exhortations to the people to get Christ, to be united to Christ, and things of the like unlimited signification; but tell them in every duty what are the measures, what circumstances, what instruments, and what is the particular minute meaning of every general advice. For generals, not explicated, do but fill the people’s heads with empty notions, and their mouths with perpetual unintelligible talk; but their hearts remain empty, and themselves are not edified.” It may be well to mention here, too, that every thing like *exaggeration* of statement upon religious subjects should be carefully avoided. This habit is not only calculated to nourish the lurking scepticism of the hearer; it is also unfavourable to the moral taste of the preacher, who may come, in time, to disbelieve himself, and whose statements may cease to bring their proper conviction to his own mind.

Let the minister (as is affirmed of the lion, though for a far different purpose) ever aim at *the heart*! The heart is the helm of the man; win that, and you win the individual. Let it then be the preacher’s alpha and omega—“Be ye reconciled to God.” “I cannot,” says Dr. Watts, “but think is a very imperfect character of a Christian preacher, that he reasons very well on every subject, and talks clearly upon his text, if he have nothing of the pathetic in his ministrations—no talent at all to strike the passions of the heart.”

5. Not only should the *matter* of a sermon be judiciously chosen, but the *manner* also. How forcible are right words! Let the apples of gold be in pictures of silver. Let truth be enshrined in a becoming medium, at once elegant and transparent. “The preacher ought to find out acceptable words:” words apt, agreeable, striking, at the same time pungent. With the polish of the shaft, let there be the point and the barb: so will yours be “the words of the wise, which are as goads, and as nails fixed by the masters of assemblies.” In short, let your speech be “sound speech, that cannot be condemned.”

6. Lastly, I add but one word on the paramount importance of *prayer*, as a preparative for the pulpit. This, it will be evident to every Christian minister and candidate for the ministry, must begin and accompany all study. It is God who alone “teacheth to profit;” and prayer is the proper instrument of bringing down from “the glory-throne” that true light, without which we shall but compass ourselves with sparks of our own kindling, and labour in the fire, to lie down in sorrow. “Three things,” said Luther, “make a divine: prayer, temptation, and meditation.” “*Bene oramus et bene studuimus.*”

II. Let me humbly remind those who have the privilege of hearing the Gospel, that they have *their parts to fulfil*. Let them beware how they are puffed up for one minister against another, as is too commonly the case. Every man has his own proper gift of God; one after this manner and another after that:

few, if any, are found, who concentrate all excellencies. God makes each necessary to his brother, and to the general perfection of the church. Let then persons, in place of unduly esteeming one, to the disparaging of another, thankfully avail themselves of all. "All things are yours," says the Apostle. Go into a garden; the flowers are not all of the same size, hue, or odour, but all combine to form a beautiful and refreshing parterre. Even so in the paradise of the church, the various gifts and endowments of ministers harmoniously unite in illustrating the glory of Christ, and diffusing "a sweet savour" of Him around the world. Preachers should be esteemed very highly in love "for their words' sake;" and be honoured, not so much for their gifts, as for the manner in which they improve those gifts.

Again, let the laity be incessant in prayer for their pastors. Alas! how much do the latter need their intercessions! Little know the majority of persons the various, complicated trials of the parish minister. His heart knoweth its own bitterness. He has his readings and studies for the pulpit; his domestic concerns (many or few, all have some); his various visits, to receive and pay, the general superintendence of his flock; and the consideration of the state of each individual in that flock; the disappointments he frequently meets with in those of whom he had hoped good; the experience, too, that often, the more he loves, the less he is loved; the care of his own spiritual state; and, in the midst of all, parochial engagements of a secular nature, of which laymen might very well disburden him (seeing he can do their duty, but they cannot do his); the continual call made upon his sympathies, both by temporal and spiritual distress—distress which oftentimes he is wholly unable to alleviate; these and innumerable other toils and trials has the Christian pastor to sustain, and that whether strong or weak, glad or in grief, in tune or out of tune; and, oh! who is sufficient for these things? To carry a person properly through all, demands a strength supernatural.

How incumbent, then, is it upon the people to be patient and forbearing toward their teachers! Above all, how are they bound to be instant and earnest in their intercessions for them! To this, a regard to *self-interest* should prompt them, inasmuch as the spiritual prosperity of a parish must ever eminently depend on that of its minister. It is a true saying, "a praying people will have a preaching pastor."

And, oh! what an important means of national reformation is the Pulpit! When this is either hushed or dead, how soon will the vicinity become a valley of dry bones! The people will be rude, barbarous, and vicious. Contrariwise; where there has been for some time a prayerful, painstaking ministry (I say for some time, for great results are not to be realized by a brief and fitful effort, but by a long course of patient perseverance), the land around is as the garden of Eden. Schools and religious societies flourish; intemperance is rare; the people are virtuous, industrious, and respectful, and, as a consequence of all, happy.

Could Satan once succeed in silencing our pulpits, alas! for the Christianity of the land! Let these, however, continue to be filled with able and faithful men, and defiance to the Wicked One and his confederates!

The Pulpit is the candlestick that holds up the light of life prominently and conspicuously before men; it is the grand instrument of convincing and overawing the ungodly; of stimulating and encouraging the good, and of diffusing a moral and religious leaven over the community. In a word, it is the chariot in which the captain of our salvation rides on, conquering and to conquer. Sabbath, and other similar schools, may do much good; Scripture readers and private Christians, visiting from house to house, may do much; the circulation of religious books and tracts may do much; but none of these, nor all together, are calculated to be near so efficacious as the pulpit. None of them are invested with the same commanding weight of authority; none tell upon such vast masses of mind; none so strikingly attract persons of all ranks, the rich as well as the poor; and consequently none can possibly exercise so wide an ascendancy over mankind. As a valuable minister of the Presbyterian body observes in a sermon, published about a year since, "Nothing will save man, nothing will relieve society, nothing will preserve the nations, nothing will avert the judgment of heaven, but the Gospel of Christ—the Gospel preached, believed, and obeyed."*

That there is a daily-brightening light illuminating the pulpits of Ireland, is one of the best, if not, indeed, the very best, symptom of the country. For when religion reanimates the clergy, there is every reason to expect a revival among the laity; and that there is such a revival among the clergy of all ranks and denominations in this island, is a fact undeniable and acknowledged. I entertain the deepest veneration for the episcopal office, deeming it, as I do, of apostolic origin; but I desire to see bishops more like those of the apostolic school.

A further blessed sign of the times is, the growing spirit of love and unity that prevails among real Christians of all true churches in this country. Though matters are far from being what they ought to be in this respect, yet certain it is, we greatly excel in brotherly love and fellow-feeling our neighbours across the channel. This may be owing to several causes. In the first place, the Irish character is constitutionally more warm, sanguine, and affectionate; less phlegmatic and reserved, in manner at least, than either the English or the Scotch. In the next place, the numbing frost of *liberalism*, which has so fearfully deadened dissenting orthodoxy in Great Britain, happily has heretofore made comparatively little progress amongst us. Thirdly, a sense of common *danger*, hemmed in as we are in this country so

* See Rev. Mr. Morgan's Sermon before the Synod of Ulster.—M^cComb, Belfast.

closely between Popery on the one side, and Infidelity on the other, drives us, like a fearful flock, more together, for mutual protection. And, lastly, (what I would fain flatter myself is the principal cause, as it were certainly the best,) a gradual common approximation to CHRIST, as to a general point and centre of union, necessarily draws us nearer to each other. Oh! let us cultivate more and more this unspeakably desirable spirit! In union is strength; with "bands," there is "beauty." Walking in harmony, hand in hand, we walk as our Lord and Master would have us; and so may the more confidently count on his care and protection. While he is the glory in the midst of us, He will be a wall of fire around us. Satan's policy is, "divide and destroy;" but let us, apprized of his design, defeat his stratagem. Like so many tribes, marshalled under the one leader, let us "*strive together*" for the faith of the Gospel. So shall we be terrible as an army with banners. And while the men of war are fighting the battle of Jehovah against the spiritual Amalek, let the people keep lifting up on their behalf the holy hands of earnest intercession. Let but the showers of grace descend upon our isle as copiously as the showers of rain, and her moral verdure will soon vie with her natural. Then will she be indeed "*the Emerald Isle!*" Yes; Ireland—dear, afflicted, interesting Ireland, the pity of the whole earth—shall yet erect her head above that sea of sorrow, all whose waves and storms have gone over her: shall arise and shine among the chief of the nations—a garden of the Lord—a paradise of lands; and regain her long lost, peerless appellation of the ISLAND OF SAINTS.

J. D. H.

AN EXERCITATION ON MATTHEW VIII. 18-34.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—One of the most important features in the whole body of the evidences of our holy religion is, the admirable coincidence observable in the distinct narratives of the life and doctrines of its Divine Founder, composed by persons who not only lived when the events were recent, but were agents in the very incidents they record. Such unparalleled accuracy can only be accounted for by the intervention of the superintending influence of the Spirit of truth; while the apparent varieties of circumstantial detail, which they occasionally discover, abundantly acquit them of all suspicion of collusion. So fully and satisfactorily have these seeming difficulties been explained, that the gainsayer now rarely ventures to render them the object of his malignant shafts. Of this class one, in whom his unbelief was rather the affliction of some demon, than a web of artful sophistry, wrought around the heart; one, in whom the desolation which reigned within his soul was rendered more awful and appalling by occasional glimpses of ineffable beauty and tenderness; and one whom a wayward spirit, undirected and unsoftened by the sanctifying influence of the religion of Jesus, and submission to the guidance of an ardent and uncontrolled imagination, held forth as an awful and warning beacon to mankind, rather than the light and ornament of his age and country, has delivered a testimony on this head equally honourable to his candour and discrimination. No discrepancies, says Lord Byron, exist in the Scriptures which cannot be satisfactorily accounted for.

Impregnable, however, as we are, even by the acknowledgment of our adversaries, we must not repose in indolent security. The slightest speck must be removed and illuminated by devout yet diligent investigation. Subjected to an ordeal which no other writings, however accurate, could endure, our Sacred Books, on every such occasion came forth with the impress of their authenticity rendered still sharper and brighter. But that which is conceded to Herodotus or Livy, may not be claimed for Matthew or Luke. Human fallibility generally, or the imperfection of their sources of information, may be urged in palliation of the inaccuracies of the former; a Divine protection from all error is asserted for the latter. Pregnant mischiefs have arisen, and their effects may be traced, in our own time, from forming too low an estimate of the inspiration of the Scriptures. In this matter many attempt to shelter themselves under the great name of Paley; thereby showing how completely they misunderstand the nature of his reasonings.

The passage of Matthew's Gospel at present under our consideration, recording the obedience of the winds and waves to the voice of their Creator, and the terror of the evil spirits at

the presence of that God against whom they had rebelled, has long exercised the ingenuity of harmonists and commentators; but the difficulties in the case appear to me to arise from an attempt to reconcile things irreconcilable—this narrative of Matthew's with that of similar incidents in Mark and Luke. The points in which they differ are so numerous, that not even in an ordinary, much less in an inspired composition could they be tolerated. These discrepancies will be found to subsist in the order of the occurrence of the events, and in their attendant circumstances.

I. In the order of the narrative of these events. Immediately after our Lord had delivered his sermon in parables, (Matt. 13, Mark 4, Luke 8,) we read in Mark iv. 35, that he orders his disciples to direct their course to the other side of the lake of Gennesareth. They convey him, accordingly as he had directed, without any delay or preparation, *ὡς ἦν*, (which words Schleusner, and the best lexicographers interpret *εὐθὺς*, *quam celerrimum*,) in the ship, from whence he had taught the multitude. In this voyage the storm, and dispossessions of the demoniacs recorded in Mark iv. 35, to v. 20, and Luke viii. 22-39, took place. The immediate sequence of these events is thus undeniably established. The allusion to the sower, and the prevalence of storms at that season, together with other considerations, which will not admit of abridgment, and which are too prolix for insertion, enables us to fix the date of these events about the close of the feast of tabernacles, or the first week of our October, in the second year of our Saviour's ministry. On this head almost all harmonists are agreed.

However numerous the irregularities may be which exist in Matthew's Gospel, thus much, at least, is certain, that no transposition occurs prior to the 14th and subsequent verses of the 8th chapter. The cure of Peter's mother-in-law, here recorded, should undoubtedly precede the sermon on the Mount, as our Lord would, most likely, take an early opportunity of manifesting his divine power to his new-called disciple. This sermon was, in all probability delivered after our Saviour's first progress through Galilee, Matt. iv. 23, perhaps three months after the performance of this cure. By the common consent of all writers, the former event is considered to have occurred in the first year of the ministry of Jesus; most probably about May or June in that year, if we may be permitted to draw such an inference from his beautiful allusions to the various objects of nature which surrounded him at that time; the birds of the air, (Matt. vi. 26,) and the lilies of the field, (Matt. vi. 28.) Now, during the autumn, that is, from the beginning of our April to that of June, vast numbers of lilaceous flowers adorn the plains of these countries. It were, then, extremely harsh to suppose such a very long interval, between the cure of Peter's mother-in-law, and the storm and dispossession, events which immediately follow each other in the narrative of Matthew.

But were I even disposed to concede this point, which I am very far from doing, in what manner can the conversation of our Lord with a scribe and a disciple (Matt. viii. 19-22) be accounted for, when we read in Mark that he sailed from the place without any delay, and consequently without landing?

I shall now proceed to a consideration of the differences in circumstances, which these narratives on comparison exhibit.

1. Matthew relates, that on their arrival at the other side of the lake they came into the country of the Gergesenes; Mark and Luke into that of the Gadarenes. Although Gergesa and Gadara were in the same district of Decapolis, yet they were at some distance from one another; and as the former was an inconsiderable place, it was not likely to give a name to the adjoining tract of the Gadarenes; besides which, it is not probable that so many swine as 2,000 were there in one herd, as in the adjoining and more wealthy country: Matthew does not specify the number; but as the Evangelists were well acquainted with the places of which they wrote, it is not to be expected that they would fall into an error about their names.

2. Matthew states that two demoniacs met our Lord; Mark and Luke, respectively, one only. To reconcile these conflicting accounts the following canon of Le Clerc's is usually cited:—*"Qui pauciora habet non negat plura dictæ aut facta, modo ne ulla sit exclusionis nota; nec qui plura habet eum qui pauciora narrat malæ fidei arguit."* Arguments put forth in the form of a definition are too frequently permitted to pass unquestioned; and have contributed eminently to disseminate and perpetuate fallacies. It is, I think, quite obvious, that a statement relative to one person or thing is, in its very essence, a special mark of exclusion; and the prevalence of this maxim would produce such a vagueness of language, that one of its most important ends would be wholly obviated. The apparent discrepancy between Matt. xx. 29-34, as compared with Mark x. 46-52, is by no means of the same class with that under consideration. Mark refers to Bartimeus alone, of the two to whom sight had been restored, because he was well known, and probably living at the period he wrote; for we learn from Quadratus that in his time (he lived about the year of our Lord 70) persons were living who had been raised from the dead, and healed, by our Lord and his disciples. When an individual is mentioned *by name* as being at a certain place, in a certain time, such a statement does not necessarily infer, unless distinctly specified, the absence of all others. But where a predication is made of one person only, it clearly excludes the presence of a second. 'I met Pamphilus today,' would convey a different impression from a declaration that I met one person. Throughout the entire of the narratives of Matthew and Mark, the presence of two individuals is as strongly asserted in the former, as that of one in the latter. Matt. viii. 29, *Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί;* Mark v. 7, *Τί ποιοὶ καὶ σοὶ ὁ τοῦ αὐθρόου;* on this last word I would lay most particular stress,

as being exclusive as language can possibly be. The reader, by accurately comparing these passages, will be enabled to perceive how completely irreconcilable they are in this particular.

Doctor Lightfoot, the most learned and instructive of commentators, is of opinion that one of the persons here alluded to was a Gadarene and a heathen, the other a Gergesene and a Jew. This he argues from the heathen name Legion, and the fact of the devils having besought him not to send them out of their own country, as being among their own when in a heathen land. And he conceives that hereby is signified comfort both to Jews and Gentiles, against the power and tyranny of Satan. However highly we may applaud the ingenuity of this exposition, and labour for the attainment of that piety which thus, in the minutest incidents of the Scriptures, discovers food for devout contemplation, it must, nevertheless, be added that we find in the narratives themselves no grounds for such an inference; yet I know not a more satisfactory mode of reconciling these passages than this. The difficulty remains, then, yet unremoved. There are a few more minor points, to which I consider it unnecessary now to advert, and shall rest my case on those which I have already adduced.

The solution of this difficulty, which I would venture to suggest is, that the respective narratives of Matthew, and of Mark, and Luke, refer to distinct events; that the incidents recorded in the former occurred in the first year of our Lord's ministry, on the day which succeeded the healing of Peter's mother-in-law; these in the two latter Evangelists, at the close of the sermon in parables. In Mark, i. 35-38, we read that on the morning of the day which followed the cure before alluded to, our Lord went up into a mountain to pray, whither he was followed by his disciples, informing him that the multitude sought him, doubtless under the influence of the miracles which he performed on the evening before, Matt. viii. 16. Here, I conceive, the narrative re-commences at the 18th verse of the last cited chapter; and that our Lord ordered their departure to the other side of the lake for the purpose of avoiding the multitude, and affording a more signal proof than hitherto of his divine authority. One of the chief reasons adduced for our Saviour's residence at Capernæum, besides the fulfilment of prophecy, was the facility afforded him of shunning the concourse which usually pressed him, by performing his journeys by water. So that his passing to and fro on the lake was no unusual occurrence. The early rains of harvest rendered a tempest an extremely probable event; while from the numerous ruins of tombs, which may be observed about the place where the town here mentioned formerly stood, we may infer that it was a much frequented haunt for demoniacs, whose practice of living in tombs was proverbial among the Jews.

I am well aware that in reply to these considerations it will be urged, that it is extremely improbable that events so much

resembling one another in their circumstances should have occurred at different times; or, if they did take place, that they should have both been recorded. This objection, however, loses much of its force, when the manner of our Lord's teaching, and the probable design of the Evangelists in the publication of their Gospels are considered. The former appears directed rather to furnish a bold outline of his doctrine, to exhibit clear and distinct proofs of his divine mission, and to prepare men for the subsequent dispensation of the Comforter, than to promulgate the whole substance of his doctrine. That which is most characteristic, and suitable to this end is repeated in different varieties of form throughout the records of his life and ministry. From the ecclesiastical history of those times, and from a variety of other sources we learn that various errors relative to the life of the founder, and the doctrines of Christianity prevailed at an early age. To correct these false impressions was the chief aim of more than one of these inspired historians. Among the calumnies which were disseminated against our Blessed Lord, that one whereby he is charged with being leagued with the powers of darkness, (Matt. ix. 34, xii. 24, Mark iii. 22, Luke xi. 15, &c.) appears to have been most frequently asserted by his enemies, and to have been most readily believed by the multitude. From this accusation our Lord vindicates himself in the passage referred to. The Talmudists even proceed so far as to assert that he was a magician, a broacher of strange and wicked worship, and one that did miracles by the power of the devil, to beget his worship the greater helief and honour. Lightfoot in Matt. xii. 29. How weak and wicked soever such a recital, at this time, may appear, and how strong soever the confirmation it affords of the accounts of his life and miracles, now in our hands (and I do not remember to have met this passage cited for that purpose) yet it must be borne in mind, that when demoniac influence prevailed, such a charge, made by men in authority, met a ready credence with a superstitious multitude. The enactments of the British Legislature against witchcraft are still on record. Hence we may account for the number and circumstantiality of the instances of dispossession related in the Gospels. We have five minute details of the expulsion of devils, together with allusions to many other instances of it, far exceeding those to any other class of miracles.

Prior, then, to his setting out on the first extensive circuit of his mission, it were extremely probable that our Lord should confirm his authority, in the eyes of his followers, by a more signal display than heretofore of his miraculous powers. Accordingly his Divinity was manifested by his tranquillizing the agitated waves, a task which was considered among the Jews as one of the attributes of Jehovah alone, Ps. lxxv. 7, cvii. 25, 29. Hereby, then, he exerted that influence over the laws of nature, which he who enacted could alone suspend; while, by the dispossessions, he evinced his superiority over the powers of darkness.

Had Mark an opportunity of consulting Matthew's Gospel, which I conceive he had not, nothing could be more natural than that on reading an account of such miraculous events of the highest order, if similar ones had occurred in another instance, he should also record them. If he had not, no apprehension of probable discrepancy could influence him to omit this incident in the composition of his history. It is much to be regretted, that at all times a great tendency has prevailed among theological writers to receive implicitly the canons and opinions which are sanctioned by the authority of critics of high reputation. Thus Saint Mark is generally said to have been an epitomiser of Matthew; chiefly, as I think, because of the eminent sanction which this hypothesis has received. A faithful comparison of the two Evangelists will show that Matthew, in some of his narratives, is far more brief than Mark; that the peculiarities recited by the latter must have been collected by an eye-witness; in addition to which we may add, that it were extremely improbable that an abridgment of so short a tract as Matthew's Gospel would be necessary for any purpose which the latter would not equally serve.

It now only remains for me to adduce instances from the Gospels, in which two or more similar events with some circumstantial variety are related, and which must indisputably have taken place at different periods. The instances which I shall allege are those only on which no controversy can arise.

1. In John ii. 14-16, we read that our Lord at his first passover drove the buyers and sellers out of the temple; he is recorded before his fourth passover to have acted in like manner, Matt. xxi; Mark xi; Luke xix.

2. He delivers the same form of prayer on two different occasions.

3. Luke vi., compared with Matthew v. vii. chapters, exhibits two different addresses of our Lord, the substance and many of the expressions whereof are identical. I could enumerate a few more instances, but those, haply, may suffice.

In conclusion, I would declare, that an unfeigned desire alone of vindicating the Scriptures from cavil and misrepresentation, not, assuredly, any ambition of novelty, has influenced me to obtrude these my humble thoughts on the reader. Should I appear to have expressed myself too confidently, let me express my earnest hope that his Christian charity will attribute it rather to inexperience than to any arrogance of disposition.

O. A.

ADDENDUM.—I have not considered it necessary to cite the authorities for some few facts which I have stated, as they may be found in the ordinary class-books, in the hands of every student.

REPLY TO PARALLEL BETWEEN MILLENARIANS AND ROMANISTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—The parallel between the Millenarians and Romanists, in your last Number, has such a mixture of truth and error; of kindness of expression with prejudice of opinion, that I feel inclined, with your permission, to strive to sever “the precious from the vile.”

There are two very common means by which error is perpetuated; the first is, not separating true doctrine from false, in systems where they are jointly held, but either rejecting or retaining all; “and the second is like unto it,” not discriminating between a true doctrine, and the erroneous maintenance of that truth. A doctrine is not necessarily erroneous, because held by Romanists; nor do we establish a heresy by tracing some similarity to a confessed error in the Papacy, because the errors of Popery are not mere inventions, but are impure corruptions of the truth. The exercising of our ingenuity, therefore, in drawing a “parallel between the Millenarians and Romanists,” may be a good way to strengthen prejudice, but is a bad method of eliciting truth. We will first examine the doctrine opposed; and secondly, search whether there be any foundation for the alleged parallel.

I. The first doctrine to which objection is made is, “That this earth is to be the theatre of the Christian eternal blessedness.” I observe in reply,

1. That this is not the doctrine of the Millenarians.

2. That this is the true doctrine.

3. That the error of Universalism does not flow from it.

4. That this has no resemblance to Popery.

5. That the interpretation of Rom. viii. 21, proposed by the Connaught Curate, would inevitably establish the heresy he deprecates.

It is quite evident that the doctrine here opposed, is not that of the Millenarians; their view is, that Messiah and the saints will reign upon this earth when renovated, not for ever, but for a “thousand years,” and then (as they say) “cometh the end.”

The “Connaught Curate,” therefore, either from ignorance or inattention, has not properly stated the question, in consequence of which, it becomes necessary for us to undertake it.

We may presume that he agrees with the Millenarians, and all the orthodox in believing that Jesus will come again to this earth, to judge the world, but then there are three points to be considered.

(1.) Whether Messiah, after some short period, called the Day of Judgment, will return to heaven with the saints; or,

(2.) Whether Messiah will reign upon earth with his saints for a thousand years, and then leave this earth for heaven; or,

(3.) Whether Messiah will reign upon earth for ever and ever.

The first I conceive to be the opinion of the "Connaught Curate;" the second is the doctrine of the Millenarians, which, I suppose, he intended to controvert; the third is the view he does actually oppose, and which I am prepared to defend.

I say the second is the proposition the "Connaught Curate" intended to oppose, and that not only because of the title to his letter, but because "the grievous heresy" which he deplores, viz. Universalism, may be connected with the Millenarian hypothesis, but does not belong to the eternity of Messiah's reign upon the throne of David; and for this reason, it is said that Jesus "shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke i. 33. Isaiah ix. 7.) "It shall be everlasting, it shall not pass away, nor be destroyed." (Dan. vii. 14.) "He shall reign the ages of ages." Rev. xi. 15, &c. It is, therefore, an article of our creed, that "of his kingdom there shall be no end." If, now, it be maintained that all these positive and negative expressions, implying perpetuity, only denote a period of a thousand years, it may equally be assumed that "the worm dieth not, &c.," and other such expressions, denoting the eternity of hell torments may also be restricted to that period of a thousand years.

2. For the proof that Messiah will reign upon this earth, I must refer the "Connaught Curate" to some express treatises upon the subject, and will content myself with affirming, that

(1.) No passage of Scripture intimates that Messiah ever will leave this earth.

(2.) That Messiah will give up the supreme dominion upon leaving the right hand of the Father, compare 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25, with Psalm cx. 1.

(3.) That Messiah, upon coming to this earth, will assume a kingdom. 2 Tim. iv. 1.

(4.) That Messiah will reign for ever, see texts under former head, and Psalm xlv., Heb. i., Psalm lxxxix, 29, 36, 37, &c.

As to the "favourite argument," or rather conjecture, in support of "this earth being the theatre of the Christian eternal blessedness, "I can only say, I never heard it used." We say this earth will not be cursed for ever, because Scripture says a time will come when "there shall be no more curse." (Rev. xxii. 3.) And we say Messiah will reign upon this earth for ever and ever, because the Scripture says, and God has sworn, that Christ shall sit on David's throne for ever. (Acts. ii. 30.)

3. I say the error of Universalism does not flow from this doctrine. Of course I use the term Universalism, not in the sense which some in modern times have, (incorrectly, as I conceive,) done, but to denote the opinion that all men will finally be saved; this, I say, has no connexion with the doctrine of Messiah's kingdom.

(1.) The principal supporters of Universalism, such as

Chauncy, did not hold the doctrine of Messiah's kingdom, therefore there is no inseparable connexion.

(2.) The majority of those who hold "the kingdom" are not Universalists.

(3.) The "Connaught Curate" has shown no connexion between the two doctrines, but an argument which, he says, is a favorite, without, however, giving his authority.

(4.) I have shown where the connexion really does exist.

4. I say, that the doctrine of Messiah's kingdom has no support from Popery. It is acknowledged now, even by our opponents, that this doctrine was held by almost all the orthodox early Fathers; that it did not decline until after the Council of Nice—was never totally eclipsed until the dark ages of Popery—and that it revived immediately upon the Reformation.

5. I maintain that the interpretation of Rom. viii. 21, &c., which, as far as I can glean from the hints he has given us, is held by the "Connaught Curate," would inevitably support "the odious and unscriptural heresy" of Universalism; because "the creature" or "creation" in v. 21 and 22, is in opposition to the "ourselves" "who have the first fruit of the Spirit," in v. 23. If, then, "the creation," v. 21, mean men, it means men with difference from "the sons of God," v. 19, and they are to be delivered when the sons of God shall be manifested.

However, I think the plain meaning of the words avoids this "odious heresy." "the creature," or "creation," is the irresponsible creation, for it "was subjected to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him, who hath subjected (the same)" v. 20. These words are, by most modern interpreters, thrown into a parenthesis, and the 19th and 21st verses are thus connected, "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God in hope, because (or, that) the creature itself shall also be delivered," &c.

I conclude this head by saying, that I believe Messiah's eternal reign upon earth is the doctrine of the Church of England. I ask the "Connaught Curate" to consider the clause in the Nicene Creed, "And he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end." This, I maintain, was intended by the Nicene Council to denote Messiah's kingdom upon earth; and this Creed has been adopted by our Church; this also explains how the doctrine of God's kingdom upon earth was put forth, by authority, in Edward the Sixth's Catechism, whilst an article was drawn up against the Millenarians.

II. The second parallel opened against "the beloved city" is respecting the doctrine of miraculous powers: here four points shall be considered.

1. Whether, according to Scripture, miraculous powers may be in the Church.

2. Whether, according to the Church of England, miraculous powers may be in the Church.

3. Whether any miraculous gifts actually be in the Church.

4. Whether the maintenance of the affirmative in either of the preceding propositions, has any connexion with the doctrine of "The kingdom."

1. Whether miraculous powers may now be in the Church, we will at once consider the quotation by Peter, Acts ii. 16 of Joel ii. 28. The "Curate" limits the fulfilment to the Day of Pentecost; those who say that miraculous powers may still be in the Church, conceive that "the effusions of the Holy Spirit" on that day, marked the commencement of the dispensation of the Spirit. Now, the miraculous manifestation at Pentecost was of "languages," which, it is remarkable, is almost the only manifestation of the Spirit *not* mentioned in Joel; it appears then evident that Joel was not fulfilled on that day, in the sense which our "Curate" supposes, viz: limited to that day, and that day only.

But we have sufficient intimations in Joel that it could not be limited to that day; for example, does not v. 31 carry us down to "the great and terrible day of the Lord?" And does not St. Paul imply, Rom. x. 13, that Joel ii. 32, refers to the whole of this dispensation. I know no limitation to "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved," before Rev. xxii. 11.

I, however, believe that there is an exception with respect to the continuance of one miraculous gift, viz.: "the speaking in unknown tongues," but not for the reason which the "Curate" seems to imply [p. 334 at bottom]—for there is still a necessity of going to teach all nations—but because I think the limitation is intimated in Scripture. St. Paul says, 1 Cor. xiii. 8, "Love never faileth, but whether prophecies they shall be abolished; whether languages they shall *cease*, whether knowledge, it shall be abolished." Now, whilst the Apostle intimates that knowledge and prophecies shall continue in the Church, until the close of this dispensation, he does not give the same intimation respecting languages, "for partially we know, and partially we prophesy, but when the perfect [state] shall have come, the partial shall be abolished." Prophecies and partial knowledge come under the category of things to be abolished by the new dispensation; but not so 'languages,' "they shall cease;" apparently the time of their ceasing is not deferred until the end of the partial or imperfect state.

2. We have now to consider whether the Church of England countenances the supposition that miraculous powers may still be in the Church.

(1.) The Church of England has ever vehemently maintained "apostolical succession."

(2.) The Church retains the rite of laying on of hands, together with the expression, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Now, apparently, it was peculiar to the Apostles to confer the power of the Holy Ghost, Acts, viii. 14, "Now, when the Apostles

which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come down prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: for as yet he was fallen upon none of them; only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus; then laid they [their] hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Now, why does our Church maintain the apostolical succession, and continue the significant act, together with the very words of the Apostle?

3. The next head has, in part, been anticipated. According to my view, the manifestation of "languages" is not to be expected. I will also add, that I have examined the manifestations of which our author calls "Irvingism," and to the best of my judgment I should say, some are excited, and that some are possessed; but I did not discern there a miraculous work of the Holy Spirit.

4. The next consideration is, whether the doctrine of miraculous powers has any necessary connexion with the doctrine of the kingdom. Here our author maintains an ambiguity, which is not favourable to the cause of truth; his argument, if distinctly stated, I apprehend would be as follows.

(1.) Those who hold the doctrine of the kingdom, also maintain that the Jews will be restored to the Land of Judea.

(2.) That the texts which our author refers either to the return from Babylon, or to the day of Pentecost, they refer to the future restoration.

(3.) That these texts speak of miraculous powers, and therefore Millenarians hold that we are to expect miraculous powers in the Church.

To all this I answer:

(1.) That it is unjust to make that a consequence of the doctrine of the kingdom, which flows, according to our author's statement, directly from an opinion held by many who do not maintain the doctrine of the kingdom.

(2.) That it is juggling to assert in the general, that texts which speak of a restoration of Jews by miracles, either refer to a restoration from Babylon, without miracles, or else to a miraculous outpouring at Pentecost, without a restoration.

(3.) That it is erroneous to assume, as a necessary consequence, that miraculous powers shall be *in* the Church, because the Jews, when *out of* the Church, shall be restored by miracles.

I, however, concede that there is some connexion between the two opinions, and it is this—The plain language of Scripture asserts both; and he who interprets Scripture literally maintains both opinions; whereas, he who uses violent figures in the exposition of one set of texts, is ready to use the same violence in the interpretation of others.

III. The next head is a supposed infallible tribunal. I affirm that there is no necessary connexion between the two opinions. We know no rule but the written word, and we are always wil-

ling, in support of our views, to appeal "to a large body of texts," as our opponent confesses.

IV. The fourth head is respecting sacrifices. Our "Curate" connects the two opinions, by reasoning similar to that under the second head. He observes that every accurate reader will perceive that the body of texts adduced in support of the Millennium refer to the restoration from the Babylonish captivity. As he has cautiously refrained from giving us any texts, we cannot judge of his accuracy, only had he excepted Zachariah and Malachi from his sweeping comment, his statement would have been somewhat less vague and inaccurate.

But Ezekiel, I suppose, is the Prophet principally intended, because, although Zachariah and Malachi speak of a priesthood, and offerings, yet "Ezekiel's Temple" is expressly mentioned, and we gather from our "Curate" that, according to his opinion, it refers to the restoration of the Jews, "together with all their rituals, to their own land, after their seventy years' captivity." The last chapters of Ezekiel, confessedly form a portion of Scripture "hard to be understood;" it follows that there is a variety of interpretations: explanations have been attempted.

Either	{	Figuratively, that relating either to	{	Christian	Dispensation;
		or		or	
				Millennial	
	{	Literally; and that either to	{	The return from Babylon.	Dispensation.
			A return still future, before the close of this		
			The future Millennial Glory.		

A question of this magnitude and difficulty cannot be satisfactorily disposed of in the small compass to which this paper must be confined. I will only observe,

1. That the "Curate's" interpretation appears a marvellous wresting of Scripture.

2. That no one of these interpretations necessarily springs out of the Millennial hypothesis, though two of the interpretations take for granted that there shall be a future, glorious state of things upon this earth. My own opinion is, that Ezekiel's Temple is not to be taken literally; for in the very same Epistle in which the anxious desires of the Patriarch for the heavenly city is mentioned, (Heb. xi. 10, 17, and xiii. 14,) which city is, I think, the City of our God, (Rev. iii. 12,) the Jehovah-Shammah. (Ezek. xlviii. 35, and Rev. xxi. 3, 22, 23.) In that same Epistle the Apostle is so strong against any more offering for sin. (Heb. x.)

Again, the sacrifices of animals have never had any value but as symbols of him, who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God. (Heb. x. 4.) So that if we granted that these sacrifices of Ezekiel were literal, we should still have to look for what they symbolized respecting Jesus. But the words of Ezekiel directly convey to me, not the idea of literal sacrifices with a symbolical intent, but of language symbolical of the inheritance, communion, and fellowship with God in Christ,

which the Royal Priesthood shall enjoy. We now eat Christ's flesh, and drink his blood, thereby showing forth Christ's death; and here it is said the sin-offering shall be to the Priests for an inheritance. (Ezek. xlv. 28.) This is confirmed by the following clause, "I am their inheritance." So that Adonai-Jehovah being the inheritance, is the same as the sin-offering, being the inheritance; hereafter will every faculty of soul and body be fitted for receiving Deity, and enjoying Christ, who was the sin, the trespass, and the meat-offering of his people.

I therefore reply, that, in my judgment, there is no necessary connexion between the doctrine of "the kingdom," and "literal sacrifices."

Respecting the interpretation of 2 Thes. ii. 3-11, it appears probable, to say the least, that the Apostle refers to Isa. xl. 4; and if so, it would be difficult to interpret that of the Popery. I think it would be easy, however, to identify the Assyrian, with the God of Ezekiel. Compare Isa. x. 5, 6, with Ezek. xxxviii. 12, (mar.) and xvii. 39, viii. 10. The passage in Timothy, I conceive, does refer to the Roman Church.

And now I have run through the letter of the "Connaught Curate," not with the intent of fully establishing the views he has controverted, or of refuting the opposites which, I presume, he maintains. The end of his paper was to prejudice the doctrine of Messiah's kingdom, by drawing some supposed analogy with Popery. I only had to show, either that the analogy did not exist, or that the doctrines impugned did not, necessarily, form a part of the doctrine of the kingdom. I must say, that though the letter was weak, the line of argument was artful; for an appeal to prejudice is an address to our most formidable opponent; for I am convinced that all that is required, in order to establish the doctrine of the second advent, is, for Scripture to be examined with patience and impartiality.

M. J.

THE EVIDENCE AND AUTHORITY OF DIVINE REVELATION.*

MAN is a most inconsistent being: he is both credulous and prone to unbelief. The great body of men receive many things as true, without any sufficient evidence—often contrary to evidence. On the other hand, many will withhold assent from truths pressed on them by evidence of the most satisfactory kind. That God does not require us to believe any thing without evidence suited to the faculties which he has given us, is a self-evident truth. That we are highly criminal by rejecting any truth of which he has given us sufficient testimony, is equally clear. To give a revelation to man in a way that would have overwhelmed scepticism is a thing quite possible with God; and at first sight, when we consider the labour that it has cost to defend Christianity from the attacks of the infidel, we are apt to wonder that God did not preclude the existence of unbelief. If any plan of communicating his mind to his creatures would have kept them from the guilt of unbelief, we are apt to ask ourselves why it has not been adopted? The fact is, that such a plan has not been adopted, and there must be wise reasons why it was not employed. Of this we ought to feel convinced, whether we could perceive these reasons or not; but some of them lie already before our eyes. It is evidently for the manifestation of what is in man, and to exhibit the enmity of the human heart against the church of God. If men did not hate the truths which are the great subject of the divine word, they would not for a moment hesitate to acknowledge the Scriptures as a revelation. Now, had the same truths been revealed in a manner that would have rendered unbelief impossible, man's disaffection to the Bible would have been the same, but he would have had no opportunity of proving it. In the way in which revelation has been given to the world, while rendered sufficient to command the belief of every human being of sound intellect, it is still possible to remain blind, to make up and swell arguments for unbelief. The plan which Divine Wisdom has chosen to communicate his mind to man, is also admirably calculated to increase an acquaintance with the sacred volume. Had the possibility of unbelief been precluded, we would not have been so much excited to a deep acquaintance with its contents. Instead of searching and scrutinizing every part of it for evidence to convince the gainsayer, we might have been contented with a lazy assent to its truth. For a minute ac-

* The Evidence and Authority of Divine Revelation; being a View of the Testimony of the Law and the Prophets to the Messiah, with the subsequent Testimonies. By Robert Haldane, Esq. Second edition. In 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 471 and 511. London: Hamilton and Co.; Edinburgh: W. Whyte and Co.; and W. Carson, Grafton-street, Dublin.

quaintance with every part of the Bible, how much are we indebted to the necessity of proof and defence?

But while it is freely admitted that the evidence of revelation is not such as the infidel demands, it is such as will condemn him for his unbelief. No man can be reasonable in rejecting the Word of God. There is a boundless variety of sources of evidence, acquaintance with which will repay the most attentive study. It may be truly said that there is no end to the discovery of evidence of the truth of Christianity. Every advance we make in the knowledge of the contents of the Book of God affords us new evidence that the Gospel is no fiction devised by cunning men.

The work before us presents the evidence of revelation in a very full, varied, and interesting manner. It is evidently the production of a writer who has made the Bible the word of his counsel, and who has the deepest acquaintance with its truths. While he labours to defend Christianity against the infidel, his chief object is to establish and increase the faith and joy of the believer. Many books on evidence either neglect the great truth which is the substance of revelation, or give erroneous or defective views of it. The author of this work professes the strongest and clearest views of the doctrines of grace, as they are professed by the Reformed Churches; and of these views he never for a moment loses sight. He alleges the evidence of revelation in common with the importance of the thing revealed; and while he labours to prove that Christianity is from God, he never allows his readers to forget what that Christianity is. One great excellence, then, of this work is, that the subject is treated in such a manner that the alleged proof is not only evidence of revelation, but evidence and illustration of the distinguishing doctrines of grace. The Christian who carefully reads these volumes will rise from his work, not only more deeply convinced of the truth of Christianity, but more fully acquainted with its most important truths.

His views of the Old Testament are peculiarly interesting. In modern times many have been taught to undervalue the ancient dispensation as being now useless. Such is not the mind of Mr. Haldane. In every part of the Old Testament he sees Christ and the things of his kingdom. With him, not only the ceremonies of worship, but the law and the prophets point to the Lamb of God, that in the fulness of time was to take away the sin of the world. The very history of temporal events is shown to bear testimony to the Gospel. In this work the Christian will be taught to read his Bible as being God's book, and to read it with the expectation of finding something profitable in every part of it.

Persons who have dear relatives, to whom they wish to recommend the Gospel, will find these volumes peculiarly suitable to them. While the work is likely to interest the student by the varied and important information which it contains, collected from innumerable sources, the common reader may find the pearl of great

price, which is so frequently laid in his way. The conversion of sinners and the edification of saints are his paramount objects. Of a treatise so extended and various it would be impossible for us, in the space which we can spare, to give extracts that would be satisfactory to our readers. There is, however, in the work, an anecdote so interesting, and so encouraging to perseverance in an effort to bring sinners to the knowledge of the truth, that we will lay it before our readers at full length. It is taken from the second volume p. 366.

"The following instance of the conversion of an opposer of the Gospel, is so remarkable, that for the glory of divine grace it ought to be recorded. I know nothing in church history, since the days of the apostles, more illustrative of the power of that grace, and of its visibly instantaneous operations, while its reality has been proved by its effects to the present time,

"The pastor of a French Protestant church, near Marseilles, visited Montauban, in the south of France, in the year 1818, when I resided there. On his arrival I was introduced to him, and we immediately entered on the subject of the Gospel. I found him strongly fortified in his opposition to the grace of God; and learned, that on his journey to Montauban, having heard of the discussions that were agitated there respecting justification, and the way of acceptance with God, he had, in various meetings, entered keenly and even violently into the subject, thinking it his duty to oppose, with all the energy he possessed, such a doctrine as that of justification by faith without works. This question, among many, we fully discussed at our first and subsequent interviews. I had not encountered one who appeared more decidedly hostile to the truth as it is in Jesus, although he was not an Arian or Socinian, but professed to believe in the divinity of Christ. Having met him one evening, I proposed that we should take a walk in the country. We immediately, as usual, commenced a discussion respecting the Gospel, each of us maintaining his own views on the subject. At length, I began to speak on the all-important declaration of the Lord on the cross, "*It is finished,*" and endeavoured to show from that expression, that every thing necessary for a sinner's acceptance with God was already accomplished, and that Christ is the end of the law, for righteousness to every one that believeth. I had only spoken a few minutes, when it pleased God to shine in his heart, giving him the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. He suddenly stopped, and with extended arms vehemently exclaimed, "*C'est trop grand pour être vrai.*" "It is too great to be true!" From that moment there was no more difference of opinion—no farther opposition on his part—no more objections. In Christ he was a new creature; old things had passed away; behold, all things had become new. It was now all his desire to hear more of the great salvation. Our conversation, in returning to town, was most interesting and edifying. He remarked, with earnestness, how differently he would preach when he should go back to his flock. He confessed, at the same time, that he had often preached on texts in which there was something he had not fathomed, "*approfondi,*" and that now he knew what that was. This is worthy of notice, as it discovers the unsatis-

factory state of mind of many, who, professing to preach the Gospel, understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm. He said, he wondered that his people should have had patience to listen to such a system as he had been endeavouring for seven years to inculcate—so totally different from what he now saw was the doctrine of the grace of God. When we parted, he, who an hour before hated and opposed the doctrine of salvation, was filled with peace and joy in believing.

"This happened on Friday. Next morning he called on me in the same state of mind in which I had left him the evening before, rejoicing in the grace of God; but he said, that being engaged to preach on the Lord's day, he read, after we parted, the sermon he had prepared, and found that not one sentence of it could he make use of, for it was altogether opposed to what he was now convinced was the truth of the Gospel. He added that he was utterly at a loss what to do, for he was not accustomed to speak extempore; and that the sermon he had with him, and which he had greatly admired, as so well composed, he would not on any account make use of. I replied, that I never knew a case so similar to his as that of the jailer at Philippi, and therefore advised him to preach on his question to the apostle, and the answer he received—'What must I do to be saved?' 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.'" After pausing a few moments, he said he would do so. The place where he preached was at some distance in the country; I, therefore, was not present, but was informed that his hearers who had known him before, listened with astonishment, wondering that he now preached the faith which so lately he destroyed. He spoke with great feeling and power, and what he said made a deep impression on those who were present. During the short time he remained at Montauban I had several most agreeable conversations with him, and shall never forget his prayer when we parted: I never heard one more affecting. It was evidently the warm effusion of his heart—entirely different from those studied and written prayers used by many of the French pastors. He referred, in a very striking manner, to his conversion, and to his former and present state; confessed the great sinfulness of his past ministry, and prayed earnestly for himself and his flock.

"On his way home he passed through Montpellier, where he preached the same sermon as in the neighbourhood of Montauban. It produced an impression on those who heard him very different from what they had ever received from the discourses to which they had been accustomed to listen. A flame was instantly kindled. The elders of the consistory remonstrated with their own pastor in the strongest manner, demanding of him how he could employ one to preach who brought forward such doctrines. He affirmed that these doctrines were the same which he himself taught. They denied this most peremptorily, and threatened to denounce him to the government. During more than three months, the greatest agitation prevailed in his church. I saw several letters, which in the course of that time he wrote to his friends at Montauban, declaring his apprehension that in the issue he would be dismissed from his charge. At length, however, the storm subsided, and the preaching of the pastor in the neighbourhood of Marseilles appeared to have been useful.

"A very different feeling was excited when the account of the conversion of this pastor was carried to his father, a man above eighty years of age. I afterwards saw another pastor, who happened at the time to be at his house on a visit; it was truly affecting, he said, to see the old man quite absorbed in the subject, and for several days going about his house, clasping his hands, and joyfully exclaiming "*Tout est accompli!*" "*It is finished!*" It is now fifteen years since the event above narrated took place, and the pastor in question has never wavered in his views of divine truth. I have heard of him at different periods since that time, and learned, with much joy and satisfaction, that he has continued a faithful minister of Jesus Christ.

"The sequel of this history is also very interesting. I received the following letter, dated September 21, 1825, from one of the most zealous and successful pastors in France, of whom I had never before heard. After a general introduction, he says, "I address myself to you, to communicate the favourable circumstances in which the Lord has placed me in respect to the ministry of the gospel, which, by his grace, I exercise. I begin by telling you who I am, and the favours which the Lord has vouchsafed to me. I pursued my first theological studies at Lausanne, in Switzerland; I continued them at the faculty at Montauban, where I was ordained in 1812. The year after I was appointed pastor at —; and about the end of 1817 I became pastor in this place. Till the month of August, 1822, I was only a blind man leading those who were blind. Much external zeal without knowledge—a vain noise of life, (*un vain bruit de vie,*) and a profound wretchedness, (*misère profonde,*) which I did not feel! Such is what I possessed. (*Voilà ce que je possédais.*) At the above period, I went to visit my former flock at —, where I saw, after nine years of separation, one of your spiritual children, my old fellow-student." (The pastor above referred to.) "He became, in the hand of God, the instrument of my deliverance. I then learned the great mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh; and transported out of myself by the joy of my salvation, I returned to my church, where since then the Lord has given me grace to render testimony to him, and to advance a little, but very little, in the knowledge of him. In spite of the opposition which the preaching of the gospel and my imprudent zeal excited in the bosom of my flock; and in spite of my own unfaithfulness and coldness, (*mes infidélités et mes froideurs,*) with which I am often affected, the word has nevertheless produced, and does produce, every day its effects. A goodly number of parishioners confess the Saviour, whose infinite compassion they have experienced; and, in general, all are more seriously attending to the gospel. I can give you but a faint idea of the field which the Lord has opened before me, and of the progress which the gospel might make if that field were better cultivated. But I am alone with the Lord. All my colleagues of the department are indifferent (*froids*) about the one thing needful."

GREEK AND TURKISH ACCOUNTS OF THE CAPTURE OF CONSTANTINOPLE.*

MAY 29TH, 1453.

The annals of the world furnish no parallel to the fortunes of the Byzantine empire: during a thousand years it resisted the combined action of destructive energies, any of which, singly, would, in half a century, have consummated the ruin of any other government of which we have either heard or read. Within were a profligate court, a corrupt church, a cowardly army, and a demoralized people. Without were hosts, whose countless myriads shook the firm-set earth, whose valour was as fierce and resistless as the storm-wind of their own deserts, and whose discipline was as perfect as any that has ever been exhibited.—All the vices that prevailed on the banks of the Tiber, accompanied the imperial court to the shores of the Bosphorus—indeed were almost the only faithful companions of its emigration;—and the Goths and Vandals were but feeble foes compared with the Saracens, the Seljukians, or the Othmans. Yet ten centuries elapsed before an empire, which simply to call feeble would be sadly to overrate its strength, yielded to these combined agents of ruin, seeming “to have its safety guaranteed by cowardice, and its security confirmed by defeat.” The empire preserved its “life-in-death” existence while patriotism was an empty name, religion a solemn mockery, or a cloak for crime, honour a mere delusion, and virtue regarded as a mere refinement of hypocrisy; it fell prostrate when, for a moment, a reformation in manners began to appear, when a religious prince ascended a throne that had scarcely for ages before been won without a crime. It is with a melancholy pleasure we turn from the gloomy retrospect of Byzantine history, to fix our attention on the last Constantine, whose heroic exertions to preserve the standard of the Cross inviolate were admired even by the Mussulmans, whose pure spirit of Christian resignation has wrung a reluctant tribute of applause from the infidel Gibbon.

The fall of the Byzantine empire includes the history of about forty years: its decline commenced on the very day that it was founded, when Constantine proudly proclaimed it the Mistress of the World. The fall of the empire is the portion of the history in which we are at present interested, and we commence with the first establishment of the Turks in Europe, A.D. 1357. The Othman Turks were then ruled by Amurath I., one of the most

* *Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantinæ*. Ducas. Bonnæ, A. D. 1834. The Travels of Evliya Effendi; translated by the Ritter Von Hammer, of Vienna. Published by the Oriental Translation Committee. London, 1834.

enlightened Sultans that ever appeared in the East, and at the same time possessing all the warlike energies that belong to the fiercest of the Seythiac tribes. The Greek empire was distracted by the parricidal and fratricidal wars of the Palæologi, a family of which, as well as the Plantagenets, it might be said that relationship was the sure cause of deadly enmity. Ducas relates a fearful instance of the hatred between father and son, simultaneously exhibited in the families of Amurath, and John Palæologus.

"Andronicus (the eldest son of the Greek Emperor) excelled all his equals in strength of body, and most of them in beauty of person. Having accidentally met Kuntuzes, (the second son of Amurath,) a long conversation arose between the princes, in which both agreed to murder their fathers, seize the respective thrones, and unite themselves by a solemn league of friendship. Information of the conspiracy was conveyed to Amurath, who instantly ordered an investigation, and when his guilt was proved, commanded his eyes to be put out. He then wrote a letter to the Emperor John, declaring what he had done, and the cause of the deed: he accused Andronicus as an accessory, and threatened immediate war unless he was similarly punished. John, either conscious of weakness, or fearing the Sultan's wrath, or through sheer stupidity, obeyed. For he was a dull, heavy, idle, sensual prince, whose chief business was debauchery, and principal occupation search after the means of gratifying his depraved appetites, while he trusted the administration of the realm to chance or fortune; wholly indifferent whether affairs turned out well or ill. He blinded not only his son Andronicus, but his grandson John, though still an infant, and scarcely able to lisap a word."

These unfortunate princes were thrown into a prison, whence they were liberated by the Genoese, who had settled at Galata, and Andronicus being, by the aid of these foreigners, raised to the imperial purple, threw his father and brothers into the dungeon from which he had been just delivered. They escaped from this prison—but we must let Ducas tell the story in his own way:—

"There was at Constantinople an abandoned scoundrel named Angel, who was nicknamed Devil, and whom many, joining name and nickname together, called Devil-Angel, (*διαβολάγγελος*;) who liberated John and his sons, after they had been two years in confinement, whether by angelic or by diabolic art I cannot determine, and conveyed them across the sea to Scutari."

Whilst a civil war raged between this precious father and son, Amurath secured a permanent footing in Europe; being aided, as we are informed in Evliyas's account, by the enthusiasm which a body of dervishes had inspired into his army:

"The brain of the whole army of Islām being thus filled with sweetness, the shores of Riūm (a corruption of Rome, applied by the ignorant Orientals to the Greek empire) were many times invaded, all the neigh-

burning country was laid waste, nor were the Káfirs (infidels) able to make any resistance; while the Moslem heroes found means of raising a noble progeny, by being tied with the knot of matrimony to the beautiful virgins whom they carried off."

Andronicus, struck with remorse at these calamities, resigned the crown. John was restored, and made his second son, Manuel, an associate with him in the empire. Amurath, after having gained a brilliant victory over the Sclavonian tribes at Cessoava, was slain; as Evliya tells us,

"While walking over the field of battle, praising God, and surveying the bodies of the infidels doomed to hell, by a knife, from the hand of one Velashko, who lay among the slain."

To him succeeded Báyzid, commonly called Bajazet, surnamed, from his impetuous valour, Yilderim (the Thunderer). To this prince every province of the Greek empire was yielded, almost without a struggle; Constantinople itself was besieged, an immense army, raised for its relief by the western princes, wholly defeated, and its momentary safety obtained only by the Emperor Manuel resigning the crown to his nephew John, who had privately covenanted to yield all Rumelia to Báyzid, receiving the Peloponnesus as an equivalent. But the citizens would not allow John to perform his agreement, the siege was renewed, and Constantinople would have fallen, had not a new and formidable enemy called the Turk's attention to Asia. Timúr, or as he is sometimes called Tamerlane, having acquired the empire of Central Asia, had extended his conquests to the confines of the Turkish acquisitions, and pretends for war between two such ambitious and fiery spirits as Báyzid and Timúr were not long wanting. The issue is known to every body; but, as modern authors have thrown some doubt on the common story of Timúr having confined Báyzid in an iron cage, we shall quote the account given by Evliya:—

"Timúr-Leng issuing from the land of Irán (Persia) with thirty-seven kings at his stirrup, claimed the same submission from Báyzid, who, with the spirit and courage of an emperor, refused to comply. Timúr therefore advanced, and encountered him with a countless army. Twelve thousand men of the Tartar light-horse, and some thousands of foot-soldiers, who, by the bad counsels of the Vizier had received no pay, went over to the enemy; notwithstanding which, Báyzid, urged on by his zeal, pressed forwards with his small force, mounted on a sorry colt, and having entered the throng of Timúr's army, laid about him with his sword on all sides, so as to pile the Tartars in heaps all around him. At last, by God's will, his horse that had never seen any action before, fell under him, and he, not being able to rise again before the Tartars rushed upon him, was taken prisoner and carried into Timúr's presence. Timúr arose when he was brought in, and treated him with great respect. They then sat down together on the same

carpet, to eat honey and clotted cream. While thus conversing together, 'I thank God,' said Timúr, 'for having delivered thee into my hand, and enabled me to eat and discourse with thee at the same table; but if I had fallen into thy hands, what wouldst thou have done?'—Yildirim, from the openness of his heart, came to the point at once, and said, 'If thou hadst fallen into my hand, I would have shut thee up in an iron cage, and would never have taken thee out of it till the day of thy death.'—'What thou lovest in thy heart, I love in mine,' replied Timúr; and ordering an iron cage to be brought forthwith, shut Báyazid up in it, according to the intention he had himself expressed. . . . By God's will, Yildirim died that very night in the cage in which he was confined."

The death of Báyazid was followed by a civil war between his children, of which Manuel took advantage to recover his throne and dominions. But Amurath II. proved as dangerous an enemy as his father Báyazid, and Constantinople again saw a Turkish army encamped beneath its walls. John Palæologus, the son and successor of Manuel, averted the danger for a time, by encouraging an impostor to dispute the throne with Amurath; but he only embittered the future vengeance by delay.

Two Christian adventurers, Hanniades and Scanderberg, gave sufficient employment to Amurath, after the rebellion was suppressed. John Palæologus went to Italy, and proposed a reconciliation between the Greek and Latin Churches, hoping by that means to obtain the aid of the Pope and the western sovereigns. But John's subjects were not inclined to change their creed, and the spells of the Vatican had lost the power of hurling Europe on Asia. John died soon after his return; Amurath did not long survive him: the former was succeeded by the last Constantine, the latter by Mohammed II., whom the Turks emphatically call **THE CONQUEROR**. Evliya gives us the following account of a prediction delivered when Mohammed was as yet but a youth:—

"During his father's life-time Mohammed was governor of Maghnessa, (Magnesia,) and spent his time there in studying history, and especially in conversing with those eminent men Ak-Shemsu-d-din and Sivásî,* from whom he acquired a perfect knowledge of the Koran, and of the sacred traditions. While he was at Maghnessa, having heard that the infidels from Fransa† (France) had landed at Akkah, (Acre,) the port of Jerusalem, and taken possession of Askalan and other towns, from which they had carried off much plunder and many prisoners to their own country; he was so much grieved at the thought of thousands of Mussulmans being carried into captivity, that he shed tears. 'Weep not, my emperor,' said Ak-

* These were founders of monastic orders; the latter, if D'Osson's Chronology be correct, could not possibly have been cotemporary with Mohammed II.

† It was a false report.

Shemsu-*l*-*d*-*d*in, 'for on the day that thou shalt conquer Islâmbol,* thou shalt eat of the spoils and sweetmeats taken by the unbelievers from the Castle of Akkah; but remember on that day to be to the faithful an acceptable judge, as well as victor,† doing justice to all the victorious Moslems.' At the same time taking off the shawl twisted round his turban, he placed it on Mohammed's head, and announced the glad tidings of his being the future conqueror of Islâmbol."

Mohammed II. had scarcely ascended the throne when he prepared for the conquest of that city, which, from the days of the prophet, had been the great object of Moslem ambition. It was an ominous circumstance that the seat of his court was fixed in Edreneh, or Adrianople, for it showed that Europe had now more attractions for the Turks than their native Asia. His first overt act of hostility was, the erection of castles which commanded the Bosphorus. Constantine wished to resent this aggression by immediate war, but if we may believe Phranza, who was present at the council, the cowardly Greeks refused to follow him into the field. Various accounts are given of the pretence which Mohammed used to justify his final declaration of war: Duca, whom Gibbon follows, declares that the Turk sent a party to forage in the Constantinopolitan territories, with the design of provoking a skirmish, and pretending that the war was commenced by the Greeks. Evliya, whose great-grandfather was Mohammed's standard-bearer, gives a more probable relation:—

"According to the peace made by Yildirim, a tithe of the produce of all the vineyards round was to be paid to the Sultan, before any of the infidels could gather a single grape. After the lapse of three years, some grapes having been gathered by the infidels, in violation of the articles of this treaty, in the vineyards of the Kûmîlî-hisâr, (the European castle on the canal of Constantinople,) a quarrel ensued, in which some men were killed. Mohammed, when this was reported to him, considered it as a breach of the treaty, and immediately laid siege to Constantinople, with an army as numerous as the sand of the sea."

Chalcondylas assures us, that the Turkish army extended from the Propontis to the Euxine; the Asiatic troops formed the right wing, extending towards the south; the centre division,

* The following seems to be the most probable account of the origin of this name for Constantinople. The Greeks who visited it said they were going, in their corrupt idiom, *ei eis eila*, whence the Turks took the name Islâmbol; and the similarity of the two first syllables to Islâm, the name of their religion, led Evliya, who was a Hajj, or Saint, to call the capital of his countrymen the capital of the Moslem religion, which Islâmbol signifies. Scamboul is, however, the popular name with the modern Turks.

† The original has a play upon words, *kâzi ve ghâzi-râzi*.

consisting of the *élite* of the besiegers, occupied the trenches in the front of the great wall; the Thracian troops were posted towards the west; while a division under the command of the Vizier, Zogan, took post north of the Gulf of Keras, above the suburb of Galata. This disposition does not differ essentially from that described by Evliya:—

"In the year of the Hegira 857, (A.D. 1453,) Sultan Mohammed encamped outside of the Adrianople gate, with an immense army of Unitarians, (Moslems,) and some thousands of troops from Arabistán, who crossed the strait of Gallipoli, and having joined the army of Islám, took up their quarters before the Seven Towers."

The enumeration he gives of the various tribes that swelled the enormous host of the besiegers, fully justifies the vivid description of the assemblage in Mrs. Hemans' "Last Constantine:":—

"Swift oars are dashing

The parted waters, and a light is cast

On their white foam-wreaths, from the sudden flashing

Of Tartar spears, whose ranks are thickening fast;

There swells a savage trumpet on the blast,

A music of the deserts, wild and deep,

Wakening strange echoes, as the shores are past

Where low, 'midst Ilion's dust, her conquerors sleep,

O'erhadowing with high names each rude sepulchral heap.

War from the West!—the snows on Thracia's hills

Are loosed by Spring's warm breath; yet o'er the lands

Which Hæmus girds, the chainless mountain rills

Pour down less swiftly than the Moslem bands.

War from the East!—'midst Assy's lone sands,

More lonely now the few bright founts may be,

While Imael's bow is bent in warrior hands

Against the Golden City of the sea.—

Oh! for a soul to fire thy dust, Thermopylæ!"

There was a soul within the city illumined by a brighter radiance, and warmed by a holier fire, than the proudest heroes of Greece or Rome could boast; to the courage of a hero and the wisdom of a statesman, Constantine added the piety of a Christian. Apostacy, he knew, would save his life and empire, but he counted both as nothing, compared with his duty to his country and his God. He stood in the last relic of a mighty empire, with the enthusiasm of a patriot and the faith of a martyr; but he stood alone. In the common danger of Christendom, the emperor thought that the Greeks might be persuaded to forget minor differences, and coalesce with the Latins, but never was there a period when scholastic mysteries engendered

fiercer strife. Ducas declares that the opponents of union with the western churches were a mere mob:—

“A reckless multitude, hostile to all that is good, the seed and root of arrogance, the branch of vain-glory, the flower of pride, the dregs and lees of the Greek, contemptible itself, and despising all others.”

But he tells us that the clergy stimulated the tumult, and exclaimed loudly against the communion of the Azymites, (those who used unleavened bread in the Sacrament,) declaring it a desecration of the Holy Elements.—The passage is too creditable to the historian's feelings to be omitted:—

“Behold your priests, your monks, your nuns, your deacons, your deaconesses, all who serve in the Greek churches and cling to the Oriental ceremonies, refused, on this day, to partake of the holy mysteries, saying that it was a polluted, not a Christian communion, averring that the Latin altars differed little from the Pagan—these very persons shall be found, at no distant time, renegades to the faith of their fathers, devoting themselves, body and soul, to the creed of their barbarous conquerors. I, myself, saw a nun, well versed in the Scriptures, not only eat flesh, clothed in a Turkish robe, but even offer sacrifice to the False Prophet, and unblushingly triumph in her apostacy and glory in her shame. But how have I been carried away over an interval of five months? Tomorrow will again impose on me the duty of telling this sad tale with tears.”

The state of religion, or rather fanaticism, in the Turkish camp, must next engage our attention. Evliya, whose name signifies *a saint*, dwells on the subject with great satisfaction.

“Seventy-seven distinguished and holy men followed the camp. The Sultan made a covenant with them, promising that one half of the city should belong to them, and one half to the Mussulman conquerors; and I will build,” said he, “for each of you a convent, sepulchral chapel, hospital, school, college, and house of instruction, in sacred traditions.” The men of learning and piety were then assembled in one place; proclamation was made that all the troops of Islam should renew their ablutions, and offer up a prayer of two inflections. The Mohammedan shout of war (Allah-el-Allah, i. e. God is God) was then uttered.”

No account is given by the Greek writers of the first summons seen by Mohammed to the besieged. Evliya says:

“At the moment of their investing the city, Mahmúd Páshá was sent with a letter to the Emperor of Konstantanizzeh. When the letter had been read, and its contents made known, relying on the strength of the place and the number of his troops, the Emperor proudly sent the ambassador back, saying, ‘I will neither pay tribute, nor surrender the fortress, nor embrace Islám.’”

The forces of the Turks have been exaggerated by Ducas, who states that there were from four to five hundred thousand men in

the besiegers' lines. Phranza, with more probability, reduces the number to one half. Our Turkish saint more grossly misrepresents the amount of the garrison.

"On one side the troops of Islam surrounded the walls like bees, crying out 'Bismullah' ('In the name of God'), and beginning the assault with the most ardent zeal; on the other hand, the besieged, who were twice one hundred thousand, crafty devils of polytheists, depended on their towers and battlements by land, and feared no danger by sea, the decrees of fate never entering into their thoughts."

Phranza, who personally aided the Emperor in preparing the list, assures us that only four thousand nine hundred and seventy *Romans*, as the degenerate Greeks had the impudence to call themselves, could be found to defend the city; but to these were added two thousand gallant warriors from the West, under the command of Justiniani, a noble Genoese.

Mohammed was provided with the largest train of artillery that had hitherto been used in war; his engineers were Christian renegades, who were disgusted with the scorn they met when they tendered their services to the haughty Greeks. The Byzantine historians run riot in describing the number, the size, and the enormous calibre of these engines; but it seems probable that they threw heavier bullets than have ever since been used. Evliya confirms their account of the great number of guns in the Turkish lines.

"They had five hundred pieces of ordnance at Seraglio Point, five hundred at the Lead Magazines (on the Galata side of the Gulf of Keras), and one hundred, like a hedgehog's bristles, inside and outside of the Kiz-kulleh-ri (Tower of Leander), so that not a bird could fly across the sea."

But the blockade was broken by five ships, under circumstances that forcibly bring to our mind the celebrated relief of Londonderry. We cannot resist the pleasure of quoting the lines in which Mrs. Hemans describes this exploit—they unite the vigour of poetry with the truth of history:—

Shout ye seven hills! Lo! Christian banners streaming
Red o'er the waters. Hail! deliverers, hail!
Along your billowy wake, the radiance gleaming
Is Hope's own smile! They crowd the swelling mail,
On with the foam, the sunbeam, and the gale,
Borne as a victor's car! The batteries pour
Their clouds and thunders; but the rolling veil
Of smoke floats up the exulting winds before,
And oh! the glorious burst of that bright sea and shore!

The rocks, waves, ramparts, Europe's, Asia's coast,
All throng'd—one theatre for kingly war!
A monarch, girt with his barbaric host,
Points o'er the beach his flashing scimitar.
Dark tribes are tossing javelins from afar,

Flanks waving banners o'er each battlement,
 Decks, with their served guns, array'd to bar
 The promised aid. But, hark! a shout is sent
 Up from the noble barks! The Moslem line is rent!
 On, on through rushing flame and arrowy shower,
 The welcome prows have cleft their rapid way,
 And, with the shadows of the vesper hour,
 Furl'd their white sails, and anchored in the bay.
 Then were the streets with song and torch-fire gay;
 Then the Greek wines flow'd mantling, in the light
 Of festal halls; and there was joy!—the ray
 Of dying eyes, a moment wildly bright,
 The sunset of the soul, ere lost to mortal sight."

This brilliant incident finds no place in the narrative of Evliya; but he relates an anecdote which probably refers to the time when the blockade was broken, which proves that Mohammed sometimes despaired of success.

"After the siege had been carried on for ten days, the Sultan assembled his faithful sheiks, and said, 'See to what a condition we are reduced! The capture of this fortress will be very difficult, if the defence of it is thus continued from day to day.' Ak-Shemsu-d-din told him that he must wait for a time, but would infallibly be conqueror; that there was within the city a holy man, named Vadúd, and that as long as he lived it could not be taken; but that in fifty days he would die, and then at the appointed hour, minute, and second, the city would fall."

But this exploit afforded only temporary relief to the besieged; the Turkish leaguer was again perfected; the fire of the artillery never intermitted; and the lines of approach came gradually closer to the wall. Mrs. Hemans describes, with great graphic power, the condition of the garrison.

It was a sad and solemn task to hold
 Their midnight watch on that beleagu'rd wall!
 As the sea-wave beneath the bastions roll'd,
 A sound of fate was in its rise and fall!
 The heavy clouds were as an empire's pall;
 The giant shadows of each tower and fane
 Lay like the graves; a low mysterious call
 Breathed in the wind, and from the tested plain
 A voice of omens rose with each wild martial strain.
 For they might catch the Arab's charger neighing,
 The Thracian's drum, the Tartar's drowsy song;
 Might almost hear the Soldan's banner swaying,
 The watch-word mutter'd in some eastern tongue.
 Then flash'd the gun's terrific light along
 The marble streets, all stillness, not repose;
 And boding thoughts came o'er them dark and strong;
 For heaven, earth, air, speak auguries to those
 Who see their number'd hours fast pressing to the close.

But while the sea was open, Mohammed well knew that his chances of success must be very uncertain; and he devised, and put into execution, one of the boldest designs we find mentioned in history. He levelled a road from the Bosphorus, behind Pera, to the haven of Constantinople, and brought eighty galleys overland into the harbour, a distance somewhat more than eight miles. We shall quote Evliya's account of this achievement, because his work is now for the first time rendered accessible to the public, and its very existence was unknown to Gibbon and the other historians:—

“The Sultan ordered Timúr-tash Páshá to employ two thousand soldiers in constructing fifty galleys, in the valley, near Kághed-khánch (a village on the Bosphorus); and some villages were plundered to provide them with planks and other timber for that purpose. Kójah Mustafá Páshá had previously constructed, by the labour of his Arab troops, fifty galleys and horse-boats, at a place called Levend-Chiftlik, opposite to the Ok-meidán (Arrowy-ground). The galleys built at Kaghid-khánch being also ready on the tenth day, the Sultan went on that day to the Ok-meidán, with some thousands of chosen men, carrying greased levers and beams, to move the said ships. By the command of God the wind blew very favourably; all sails were unfurled; and amidst the shouts of the Moslems crying, ‘*Allah! Allah!*’ and joyful discharges of muskets and artillery, the ships slid down from the Ok-meidán into the harbour. The terrified Káfirs (infidels) cried out, “What can this be?” And this wonderful sight was the talk of the whole city. The place where these ships were launched is still shown, at the back of the gardens of the arsenal, at the stairs of Sháh-kull; within the Ok-meidán. The millet which was scattered there under the ships (in order to make them slide down more easily) grew, and is to this day growing in that place. All the victorious Moslems went on board, armed cap-à-pee, and waited till the ships built by the Timúr-tash, at Kaghid-khánch, made their appearance at Izzúb (near the extremity of the harbour), in full sail, with a favourable wind. They soon joined the fleet from Ok-meidán, amid the discharge of guns and cannons, and shouts of ‘*Hot! Hot!*’ and ‘*Allah! Allah!*’ When the Káfirs saw the illustrious fleet, filled with victorious Moslems, approach, they absolutely lost their senses, and began to manifest their impotence and distress. Their condition was aptly expressed in that text (Koran II. 18), ‘They put their fingers in their ears, because of the noise of the thunder, from the fear of death.’”

It was assuredly, as Sir Walter Scott says, on a somewhat similar occasion—

“It was a wondrous sight to see
Topmast and pennon glitter free,
High-raised above the green-wood tree,
As on dry land the galleys move
By cliff, and copse, and alder-grove.”

Ducas, of whom we must not altogether lose sight, gives a very faithful description of this achievement; we must paraphrase,

rather than translate, his account, for the Byzantine Greek is in this place worse than usual.

"He (Mohammed) devised a daring stratagem, worthy of a brave and noble mind. He ordered a road to be levelled through the brambles and thistles, from the spot between the two pillars above Galata towards the east, down to the opposite coast of the Ceratine gulph, and the ground to be made as level as its nature would permit. He then commanded the ships to be placed on rollers, with all their sails set, and thus to be drawn down into the bay of Ceras.* This was done. The galleys were thus dragged along, having each a look-out man at the prow, and a steersman at the helm; a third hauled the yards and directed the sails; a fourth was employed to beat a drum, while trumpets were playing naval music. They passed over heights and hollows, bramble-hillocks, and water-courses, as over the waves of the sea. Whoever heard of or saw a similar event? It is true, that Xerxes made a bridge over the sea, and led a mighty army from Asia to Europe; but this new Alexander, the last tyrant of his race, as I hope, brought vessels over the mountain tops, and converted the land into sea."

Evliya, who has a true Oriental taste for digressions, having described the arrival of the fleet in the harbour, proceeds to give us some personal sketches of Mohammed's principal officers. A renegade monk, named Peter, is commemorated as the most enterprising of the Moslems. The multifarious avocations of Jubbeh Ali render him, however, a more important personage; he had been father confessor to Kelaun, the Sultan of Egypt, but had volunteered to assist in the capture of Islámbol; he wore a horse-cloth (jubbeh) instead of a coat, whence he derived his name; while the army remained in winter quarters, he took lessons in theology from an illustrious Imám, and at the same time diligently practised military exercises.

"He was afterwards, when Mohammed marched against Islámbol, made chief baker (!) and provided, no creature knows how, from one single oven, the whole army, consisting of many hundred thousand servants of God, with bread as white as cotton."

In addition to all these qualifications, he was an admirable drummer; could raise a battle-shout equal to the joint clamour of thousands; and by his skill as an engineer hastened the fall of "the infidels doomed to hell." Next to him comes Khorús-dede (Father Cock), an old man, from Khorassan, who anticipated the wakeful bird of morning in rousing the soldiers, by crying out, "Arise, ye forgetful." And, finally, there was Hersék-Oghí, who not only defeated all his foes, but pounded them till they were reduced to a mummy.

(To be continued.)

* *Keras*, a horse: the harbour of Constantinople still retains this name.

ON THE LAWFULNESS OF RETAINING RICHES, &c.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—I have in a former communication suggested some principles on which, I conceive, the lawfulness of a Christian's continuing in the state of life, however exalted, to which Providence has called him, may be consistently maintained. But I am induced again to recur to the subject, in consequence of a letter which I have received, and which contains the following passage:

"Will you excuse my troubling you with this line to ask, whether it has ever occurred to you as possible, or as useful, to draw any line to help a conscientious person to decide what is to be considered a proper conformity to the rank in life in which a Christian may be placed, and what may be considered going beyond it? In a conversation with a friend, not long ago, on the two distinct opinions held by Christian ministers, as to the general subject of our habits of life, &c., she observed that, after all, any thing like an absolute principle to direct us was left untouched. To say that we should conform to our situation and circumstances in life, was, in fact, leaving each individual simply to answer to his own conscience what that might be; (and after all, dear Sir, would it not come to this?) But she seemed anxious to know whether it was possible to mark any line which might be a help to the weak, and a restraint upon self-deception, and self-indulgence. I feel confident that you will excuse my thus addressing you, and also suggesting to you to write a few lines on the subject in the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER."

Glad as I should be to meet these wishes of a valued friend, I confess I find myself quite at a loss to enter upon the subject; at least in the manner here intended. If, indeed, the thing proposed were, simply to lay down precise and practical rules for persons of wealth and station how best to employ that wealth, and turn that influence to account, I should decline the office, merely upon the ground of my own personal want of fitness. But if I am required in this letter to point out, on the one hand, to what extent persons of wealth and rank are to maintain their providential stations, and, on the other hand, how far they are to accommodate to the principles of those who call for an entire relinquishment, my answer is, that no such middle line can be ascertained or recommended; that those in high places are to keep their ground, without abatement; and that no compromise is to be made with principles radically erroneous. Yes; it is my firm conviction, that to suppose Christianity to be at variance with the order of society is, so far, utterly to mistake its nature.

Christianity is frequently compared in Scripture to light; and in nothing does the resemblance hold with more exactness than in this—that neither the one or the other can, by any description, be made apprehensible, unless the object itself is directly presented to the appropriate faculty. Let us suppose a person to have

lived from infancy in a region on which material light had never shone. Let us suppose him to be told, that light was now about to visit that realm of darkness—that when it came, it would fill, at once, the whole expanse, and be present, at once, in every department and corner of the land. Such a person might naturally conclude that, at the approach of this new visitant the whole system of things must be displaced, and that a general removal must be made, to leave room for the presence of this all-occupying substance. But these false notions would be wholly dissipated when the dawn arose. Then, and not till then, it would be manifested, how light can be every where, and yet disturb nothing; how it can occupy every place, and still remove no former occupant; how it can, in a word, co-exist with every thing but darkness. Thus it is with that which is, in a higher sense, “the light of the world.” The office of religion is to fill and to pervade the whole, and shed abroad its influences through every ramification of the system. But it is not its nature or its province to remove the landmarks, or to make way for itself by levelling the scale and order of society. All notions which imply this arise, more or less, from a want of discerning the spiritual character of religion. They are bottomed on a misconception of its mode of operation; they confound the kingdom of grace with the kingdoms of this world, and turn the animating principle into the rival of the very things which it comes down from heaven, not to disturb, but to sanctify, to purify, and to bless.

If the call of the Gospel were to level the distinctions of human life, the system would, in a measure, be self-destructive. For, as a moral guide, it is addressed throughout to man as standing in such relations as imply diversity of rank. It, therefore, effectually secures against the decomposition of the materials on which alone it is formed to act, by the rule laid down in 1 Cor. vii. 20, “Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.” On the dead level of equality, where would be the field of exercise for humility, condescension, munificence, or contentment? Or, in what manner could the Christian be instructed, with St. Paul, both how to be abased, and how to abound? It would be needless to multiply passages which prove the rich materials which distinctions of rank provide for the exercise of Christian graces, and for the development of the best affections of the heart—graces and affections which ennoble poverty, and, amidst all its possessions, raise the mind above this world; which enable “the brother of low degree to rejoice in that he is exalted, and the rich in that he is made low.” Amongst various passages of like import, I will notice two which occur in 1 Tim. vi.: in verses 1, 2, the Apostle thus speaks; “Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God, and his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but rather do them service, because they are faithful, and beloved

partakers of the benefit." And in verses 17, 18, 19, he says, "Charge them that are rich in this world that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." I shall refer to but one more passage, namely, 1 John, iii. 17; "Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" In these words it is distinctly recognised, not only that the love of God may dwell in one who has this world's good, but that the right use of these possessions may be the means of his assimilation to the character of the divine nature. It would be useless to adduce more instances. The New Testament, throughout, gives proof in every part that society, separated, as we find it, into several ranks and orders, is the very school in which Christianity was formed to teach.

That there is a path of separation from the world, in which every one must walk, who would follow in the footsteps of his Saviour; and that this path is moreover one of lowliness and self-denial, no man who is acquainted with the Scriptures can for a moment doubt. But that the path thus pointed out is to be understood in a spiritual and hidden, rather than a palpable and external sense, I think clear from the manner in which our Lord describes it. "Strait," says he, "is the gate, and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Now, if the meaning of this passage were that, as Christians, we are bound to relinquish our providential stations, and come down to a low estate, the difficulty might indeed be formidable to flesh and blood, but it would not be the kind of difficulty here alluded to. It would doubtless require a devotedness and resolution which few possess, to give up the brilliancies and luxuries of wealth, and embrace the hardships and trials of a mean condition. Still this course, though arduous, would be plain and visible to human eyes; it would lie as palpably before us as the broad way which leadeth to destruction; nor could it be affirmed of such a path that few can find it. It is this latter expression which marks, not only the difficulty, but the nature of that way which leadeth unto life. The Christian's is not a secluded path, into which he can turn aside, and, by an external extrication, come out and be separate from the world. His is a critical and intricate line of movement, running directly through that enemy's country, where perils await him on the right hand and on the left. Here, indeed, his heart might fail him, were it not for that voice which says, "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee, and through the rivers they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee." But this is not, I repeat it, the

difficulty to which our Saviour points. It is not that which calls for resolution to keep the narrow way, but for discernment to see it. None but that single eye which fills the soul with light—no teaching but that of God can *show* the path which leads us onward to his presence. This alone, I say, *can* lead our footsteps right; and why? Because the Christian's separation from the world consists not in choosing between two visible courses, the one of humiliation and abasement; but in walking by faith, and not by sight—leaning on that Almighty arm which can conduct him in equal safety along the heights, and through the depths, and amidst those dangers which, in riches and in poverty, and in every possible variety of outward circumstances, encompass and war against the soul.

But it will be said, is the Christian's disconformity with the world to be altogether an inward habit of the mind? Is he, for instance, if placed in high station, to give no visible manifestations that he is not "of the world?" To this I answer that he should differ from *his* equals, just as his inferior brethren do from *theirs*; but that there is nothing in wealth or rank which requires of Christians who possess them to dissent, any more than humbler Christians do from the usual habits of their station. A religious nobleman is required to be just as unlike what noblemen are in general, as a religious tradesman or a religious servant is, and must be, unlike tradesmen and servants in general, and no more. In these several stations precisely the same rule is to be followed. They are all of them lawful callings, and all equally honourable in the sight of God. And if they are so, the stations themselves, with all their legitimate appendages, are to be upheld. But all that is sinful in the ordinary habits of those who fill them, is to be renounced. If noblemen, in general, give far too little to the poor, and devote still less, in comparison with what they ought, to religious purposes—the nobleman who would save his soul, must here differ from the world. If noblemen often spend much of their time and fortunes in vain and vitiating amusements, here again must be the same dissent from common practice. If noblemen often out-spend their incomes, and show thereby that the magnificence in which they live is not a thing to which they conform as duty, but a thing preferred to duty, and chosen for its own sake; it is equally plain that, in this respect also, the Christian nobleman must come out from among them and be separate. He must do so on the same principle that, if tradesmen cheat and footmen drink, the Christian who fills those stations must dare to be singular. There is nothing, however, I repeat it, necessarily belonging to the largest fortune, or the most exalted rank, which it is inconsistent with the most entire devotedness to God to conform to or uphold. But can it be right for the disciple of a crucified Master to keep a number of servants in expensive liveries, to drive in costly equipages, and to move from one splendid mansion to another? Would it not be better, at least, to lay these superfluities aside, and give the price of them

to the poor? To this I answer, that every man in easy circumstances is bound to devote a considerable share of what he has to works of piety and mercy. But if, after this, the station in which our stewardship lie be such as implies a certain magnificence of living as its usual accompaniment, in this case the conscience may be fully satisfied by the consideration that all the great man spends comes down ultimately to the labouring poor; it feeds the channels of honest industry; and as prevention is better than cure, the residence of a wealthy proprietor does still more good, by enabling the inferior classes to maintain themselves, than by assisting them when reduced to poverty.

But do not state and grandeur expose their possessor to peculiar danger? Do they not offer temptations, which none else can feel, to pride and vanity? I grant that a person suddenly raised to a sphere of life above his early and long-accustomed habits, might be, as it respects humility of mind, at no small hazard. His associations would have been formed in different circumstances, and his present elevation might therefore appear, in too flattering a contrast with those former equals with whom he had been used to compare himself. But I do not believe that the appendages of high station minister in any peculiar degree to the vanity of those to whom they have been always familiar. They are all mere things of course, nor does it enter into the thoughts of men, in general, to pride themselves in their superiority to those who aim at no competition with them. The fact is, that pride is an appetite which much have something new to feed it. It is the perversion of a principle which breathes after loftier things than this low world can furnish; it is consequently always looking upward; and no sooner has it reached any earthly object than it finds it empty and unsatisfying, and continues its upward tendency to something higher. In this view, I doubt whether the great have not the advantage over their inferiors; they are better placed for making the discovery how paltry and less than nothing are the baubles of time and sense; they have less beyond them to deceive and flatter with fruitless expectation; they have tried the things which others are toiling after; and no man ever tried them without finding that they are lighter than vanity itself.

H. W.

(To be continued.)

THE LIFE OF THE REV. R. HILL.*

OF the holy life, the extensive usefulness, and eccentric manners of Rowland Hill, who has not heard? Persons of all ranks and all characters have had their attention directed to him. In every part of the British empire his name is recognised as connected with scenes and events which call forth emotions of no ordinary interest, expressive of admiration at the disinterestedness of his exertions for the spiritual good of his fellow-creatures, and strong conviction of the genuineness of his piety and devotedness to God. Often in our travels through the different towns and villages of the three kingdoms, have we ourselves listened to the artless tales which gained currency concerning this good man, and which, whether correct or incorrect, seemed to have originated in some eccentric act or saying, that had excited, at the time, impressions of a serious nature, on the mind of the hearer, and, by often repetition and extended circulation, had, though changed in its form, still preserved the marks of piety and benevolence characteristic of the man. Such, indeed, was the influence his name had in society, that the most distant strangers to each other have seemed to feel themselves drawn together in close familiar acquaintanceship, at the mention of it; and whilst running over in conversation, alternately hearing and reciting what had been reported of him, in our lonely rambles through life, we have forgotten, in the pleasure of the hour, that we were strangers in a strange land. It gives us pleasure, therefore, to have to announce to the public an authentic memoir of his life, by his relative, Rev. Edwin Sydney, A.M., who, from an early period, was favoured with close and intimate association with this venerable servant of Christ, and through successive stages of his life, seems to have possessed a large share in the confidence and affection of his aged friend, consequently might well be considered as capable of giving us a true and faithful narrative of his character and conduct in the different scenes through which he passed. As such, he appears to have been regarded by Mr. Hill himself and the venerable lady who had the happiness of being early united in marriage to this man of God, and who greatly aided him in his numerous labours of love and works of faith, both by her counsels and her sympathies, as we learn from the preface, where Mr. Sydney lets us into the origin of his engagement in this work.

"The last evening," says he, "I ever spent with Mrs. Rowland Hill, she expressed a wish, that if I survived her venerable and beloved husband, I

* The Life of the Rev. Rowland Hill. By the Rev. Edwin Sydney, A.M.

should write an authentic narrative of his remarkable life; and I promised that I would, if possible, fulfil her desire. Mr. Rowland Hill, acquiescing in this request, bequeathed me all his papers, 'to be used at my discretion.'

Although we fully acquiesce in the sentiments expressed by Mr. Sydney as it regards the piety and active labours of our brethren, the clergy of the Established Church, at the close of this preface, we were at a loss to define the reason of his introducing them at the commencement of such a work as this. We first thought that his love of ORDER and DECORUM, had suffered a little violence, in presenting himself before the public as the biographer of Rowland Hill, and our fears were excited, lest we should find in the body of the work indications of a cold and calculating mind, frittering away, by apologies, the pleasurable emotions excited at the contemplation of this amiable luminary of the Gospel, in his eccentric, but useful course, amidst the churches of Christ; or discover the cautious mind withholding from us some of those irregularities which, though they betrayed no very rigid attention to ORDER and DECORUM, according to human conception of things, yet show us more of the man's real character, and give a more powerful evidence of his ardent zeal, sincere devotion, and lively concern for the conversion of souls, than any thing else could afford. However, we are happy to say that no such feeling is any where manifested; on the contrary, Mr. Sydney seems, with his decided attachment to the Church, to have imbibed much of his aged friend's spirit of genuine affection to all that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and, instead of keeping back, has given, *con amore*, many specimens of the free and unrestrained labours of Mr. Hill, in different parts of the United Kingdom, as a preacher of the Gospel of the grace of God. But upon a second consideration of the subject, we thought that perhaps Mr. Sydney participated with us in the melancholy conviction, that the Dissenters, who professed great affection towards Mr. Hill, and were many of them greatly indebted to him for his countenance and support in their ministerial career, were now engaged, in united labours, with infidels and radicals, to overturn the venerable fabric, which ever appeared lovely in his estimation; seeking, with ruthless hand, to raze to the foundation, that, which he looked upon as the bulwark of truth, and wished to see reformed, but not destroyed. Thus feeling, perhaps he was desirous, at the very threshold of his work, to bear testimony to his own decided attachment to the Established Church, whilst in the body of it, he buried all peculiar feelings, in reference to that Church, and spoke of religion, as his friend regarded it, unconnected with names or parties. If so, we go along with him in his feelings; at the same time we must candidly confess that, viewing the conduct of the Dissenters of England in their present measures of political agitation in juxtaposition with the association that was wont to take place between them and the worthy subject of this memoir—we have said to

ourselves, "How must his righteous soul have been vexed, had he lived to witness their operations, or to behold their painful results." "He has surely been taken away from the evil to come."

Our readers, it is hoped, will forgive us for having indulged so long in these reflections, suggested by the character of the person whose life is before us, and the origin of its being sent into the world by the reverend gentleman, to whom we are indebted for the pleasure we certainly have felt, and which we doubt not will be felt by thousands whilst reading it.

The book contains twenty chapters, having for their running titles the following subjects: "Antiquity of the Hill Family; Mr. Rowland Hill Refused Orders by Six Bishops; Mr. Rowland Hill prepares for Marriage and Orders; 1774; Remarkable Conversions; Surrey Chapel; 1782; Sunday Schools; Mr. Rowland Hill's Mode of Preaching; My own Recollections of Mr. Rowland Hill; Festivities at the Conclusion of the War; Village Itinerancy; The Society at Surrey Chapel; Pastoral Character; Ministerial Advice and Charities of Mr. Rowland Hill; Mr. Rowland Hill on Prophecy; Last Illness of Mr. Hill; Bible Society, 1831; Christian Sabbath; Retrospective View of Religion during the last Century." Under each of these particulars many interesting incidents, connected with the life and times of this estimable man of God, are introduced, which the limits assigned to this department of our work will not allow us to notice; we can only select a few that strike us, as opening to us a fair opportunity for suggesting some lessons of practical utility.

From the first chapter we learn that Mr. Hill was the sixth son of Sir Rowland Hill, Bart. of Hawkstone, in the chapelry and parish of Hodnet, under Red Castle, and seems to have been at a very early age impressed with the importance of religion, and had these impressions strengthened, perpetuated, and increased, by affectionate admonitions and letters received from his brother, Richard, who, before he succeeded his father in the title, had been decidedly attached to the cause of divine truth, and was anxiously bent on seeking the salvation of his relatives. As, however, there appears to us nothing very uncommon in the experience of Mr. Hill at the commencement of his religious life, we shall pass over that part of the work, merely stating that, having been previously at Eton School, he was removed to Cambridge in 1764, where he soon became acquainted with the celebrated John Berridge, Vicar of Everton, who seems to have been of the same cast of mind, and formed for the same habits, as himself. It was not long after he had been entered as a student at Cambridge, that Mr. Hill commenced preaching there and in the adjacent villages, which conduct, as was to be expected in those days, brought down upon him the severest censure from his college, and insults from the populace of the town, insomuch that at length the opposition to the young preacher "became very serious and decided; and he wrote to consult the celebrated Mr.

Whitfield, who, in his answer, exhorted him to go forward in his labours, and it is unnecessary to say that his advice was fully complied with.

The second chapter commences with the refusal, he met with from six bishops, to ordain him as a minister of the Established Church, owing to the irregularities with which he was charged during his stay at Cambridge, and his disinclination to promise to confine himself in future to the rules of the Church. On this subject we are aware many opinions have been expressed, condemnatory of the conduct of the bishops: but, as far as we ourselves are concerned, we freely confess that whilst we can see in the things that are charged on Mr. Hill as irregularities, during his studies at Cambridge, only the legitimate operation of a pious mind sympathising with the wants and woes of perishing sinners; consequently, nothing to disentitle him to a free and full recognition as a minister of Christ by the bishop, yet, at the same time, when in the perfect knowledge of the laws and ordinances of a Church, a person manifests a "disinclination" to abide by those laws, we do not see how any one can harshly censure that bishop who deems it prudent to withhold his official recognition. Whatever men might say against the laws themselves, none can deny that, to those who receive their validity, a refusal to abide by them forms a legitimate ground of exclusion from the ministry of the Church which owns them as part and parcel of her discipline. To disregard the law in one branch is to subvert its authority in all. We find, however, that the want of ordination did not prevent Mr. Hill from proceeding in his engagements as a preacher; but under countenance and frequent admonitions of his friend Berridge, he went forth as an itinerant, and,

"In the year 1771," Mr. Sydney tells us, "many parts of Gloucestershire, Somersetshire, and Wiltshire were visited by Mr. Hill. He has himself recorded, in his diary, many of the texts from which he preached, and the effects of his sermons. He then describes the difficulties he had to contend against, and the success which followed his efforts to spread the knowledge of the truth."

In looking over the extracts from his diary, furnished us by Mr. Sydney, we find that our worthy friend often betrays what strikes us in all the published diaries of preachers, a mind led away by the state of outward circumstances and animal spirits, to form an estimate of the value of the labours in which they were engaged, viewing them as profitable, or not, according to those outward circumstances and animal spirits; an example of which is furnished in p. 61—

"On the morning of the following day, he preached at Kingwood, and in the evening, he says, he had the honour to commence viler than ever, by renewing field-preaching in Bristol, to some thousands, upon Acts iii. 19. 'Repent ye, therefore.' The word was with power—the people were deeply attentive, and a great blessing seemed visible in the midst of us."

Every person who takes a candid view of such passages as these, (and they are not a few,) must regard them as the effects of external excitement. He was, as he describes himself elsewhere, "at liberty;" that is, his memory was active, his mind was unembarrassed, and his words were at command; the people were attentive, and the scene was pleasant: from these he argues that the word was *powerful*; when, perhaps, in other scenes, and other personal feelings, spiritual benefit was more genuine, and more extensive among the hearers. We cannot be too much impressed with the fact, that it is truth carried home to the heart, by the Spirit of God, and not the state of the person's mind who preaches, that gives power and efficacy to the preaching of the cross.

In closing our notice of this stage of the life before us, we beg leave to bear our testimony to the truth of the remark made at the foot of p. 59.—"No person ever exceeded him in his admiration of the spirituality and beauty of the Common Prayer." In confirmation of which we remember once being in his company, in his lodgings, in Dame Street, Dublin, when the subject was introduced in conversation, and he made this remark in a deep and fervent tone of piety and sincerity, "I never think of those prayers without saying, God be thanked that they were ever written!" And here we must express our wonder that *this* visit to Dublin is never noticed by Mr. Sydney—a visit, which, perhaps, afforded as many and as affecting incidents in Mr. Hill's life as any that attended his ministerial career.

In the following chapter we find Mr. Hill turning his thoughts to the marriage, state and as the letter he addressed to the lady, making proposals, which were accepted, is rather a curiosity of its kind, highly characteristic of the man, we shall quote it for our reader's perusal:

TO MISS TADBURY.

MY DEAR MADAM—I am told by my dear sister, that you are no stranger to a very important correspondence, in which you are a person very intimately concerned. Suffer me, dear Madam, with the utmost simplicity, to speak all my mind. And first, I think I can safely say with all my heart, as before the presence of God, that I love your person. Without this, on both sides the question, there can be no real happiness in such a connexion as you know is upon the *tapis*. Permit me also to say, that I am fully persuaded of the truest work of grace upon your soul; and though I know the sincerity of your mind makes you, at times, doubt of every thing, yet your very doubts to me are the strongest evidence of the sincerity of your heart. Thus, as a man and as a Christian, with your leave, would I be glad to make choice of you as my partner through life. But now, dear Madam, let us, above all things, consult matters honestly before God, as to your union with a poor worm, in the character of a minister of Christ. Here I will be explicit, as I mean, above all things, to be honest before God. The present plan of labour, to which it seems evident to me it has

pleased God to call me, will frequently compel me to leave my home, wherever it may be, and to take up, at times, the life of an itinerant; and such a life as this, you must expect, will sometimes be attended, as to myself, with hardships and contempt. Were your kindness for my person, however it might be the language of love, to make you attempt to dissuade me from this, such dissuasion would not only be a burden upon my mind, but also, if not complied with, a grief to yourself. And now, dear Madam, if such an union should take place, do you think you could make your mind perfectly easy in thus giving me up to the service of the Lord? Can you be content to see me a despised pilgrim for my once despised Master; rejected for my labours, and reproached for my God? I know the diffidence of your mind will make you a little stagger at these questions, and yet I believe, at the same time, you will find something arising at the bottom of your mind, earnestly anxious to answer them aright. And should such be your views, should you be able to love me on the one hand, and yet to give me up when called to it on the other, suffer me to frame to myself the happy idea of being possessed of such a companion in tribulation, and such a partaker of my joys, as will give me reason of thankfulness to the day of my death; &c. &c.—pp. 77-8.

Perhaps this letter gives us as much insight into the character and constitution of Mr. Hill's mind, as any thing to be met with in the whole Memoir. It is too long to insert the whole of it; but what has been given shows a determination to give himself wholly to the ministry; at the same time, candidly to set before the woman of his choice the kind of person she was to expect, and the nature of the life she was to anticipate. We believe, from all we know and have heard, never were two persons more adapted to each other.

On the twenty-third of May, 1778, Mr. Rowland Hill was married at Mary-le-bone Church, and went immediately, with Mrs. Hill, into Somersetshire, where he was ordained deacon, on the Trinity Sunday following, by Dr. Wills, the aged Bishop of Bath and Wells. His title to orders was the parish of Kingston, in that county, and his stipend forty pounds a-year. Yet, as he was ordained *without any promise or condition*, he persevered in his itinerating movements till at length, we find him the stated pastor of Surrey Chapel, London, a large and beautiful place of worship, built expressly for him, on the spot where he had preached out of doors to thousands, and been the means of converting many of those who were principal subscribers to the building. Here he remained as pastor; though he did not confine himself to that place until he *died in a good old age, "full of days, riches, and honour."* Indeed, from the extended enumeration of places he visited, and the texts on which he preached, which bear, in our opinion, by far too great a proportion of the materials of the work, we learn that his was a life of constant and laborious exertion, in the promulgation of the truths of the Gospel. Such a life might suit a man of Mr. Hill's character and genius, but we conceive few could follow it up either with

much profit to the Church, or much comfort to themselves. A lively imagination, a readiness to seize on passing events, and a fluency of expression will form the itinerant, and enable him to present truth, in its first principles, to the mind of the unconverted, so as to awaken a concern for the interests of the soul, and convey pleasure to the converted in hearing; but to build up the church of the living God in their most holy faith, to fortify them against the wily arts of the tempter, and establish them in the hallowed enjoyments of religion, a stated and resident ministry is of the highest importance; which must be prepared for by patient investigation and constant study.

Little can the habitual itinerant, generally speaking, act under the influence of the apostolic exhortation, "Give thyself to reading." However, as it hath pleased God to distribute his gifts among men according to his own sovereign pleasure, we rejoice in the labours of him that can feel pleasure, and confer profit on his fellow-men, in pouring forth the extemporaneous effusions of a pious mind, and could wish to see the order of Evangelists revived in the persons of men whose talents and habits fit them more for the labours of the missionary than the work of the pastor.

In these remarks we do not wish to be understood as abstracting from Mr. Hill's pastoral character. No: would that all who settled down as the minister of one parish acted as he is represented in the pleasing account of his visiting his flock, given at p. 312.

But we must close our notice of this Memoir by repeating our acknowledgment of the great pleasure afforded us in the perusal; whilst we would say that, had the editor given us fewer extracts of his diary, recording places and texts which present no very distinguishing characteristics of such a man as Mr. Hill, and enlarged upon the nature and manner of his intercourse with his friends, and the world at large, we should have been able to form a more definite idea of what constituted the peculiar features of his life and character than at present. In the book before us, we see the ever-active preacher, but not the ardent, self-denying, and universally influential, though eccentric Rowland Hill. We read, and find it is of Mr. Rowland Hill; but it is not the man we have long contemplated with our mind's eye as the venerable and venerated preacher of Surrey Chapel, London.—It might, we conceive, have been shorter, cheaper, and yet more characteristic.

ON THE PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—Unless you have something better at hand on the subject, you will, perhaps, admit into your forthcoming number a few remarks on the present state of the Church of Ireland, and on the inquisitorial treatment she is about to be submitted to, preparatory, as I fear, to the confiscation of her property, and her disestablishment as a national church.

And here, before I begin, allow me to state *what* I am, which declaration may afford the reader some grounds for judging how far I may write under the influence of prejudice or interested motives. I am, Sir, a presbyter of thirty years' standing in the ministry, during the greater part of which time I have laboured as a parish curate; and I can truly say, that if the bountiful Providence, that has hitherto kept me in all my ways, were to deprive me of health, without calling me into eternity, I and my family would, as far as human foresight can discover, be left in a comparative state of poverty. It is not, then, from any enjoyment of the goods of the Established Church that I feel and would exert myself for her in her hour of peril. I have not basked in the sunny smiles of episcopal favour; I have not had the interest whereby government preferments are gained; I have not had the relationships whereby lay patronage is obtainable; and therefore have nothing to lose, but that hope, which, though it be said to come to all, yet may well be said to be taking wing to fly away for ever from the grey-headed curate.

Having thus, with an old man's garrulity, spoken of myself, I shall proceed to remark, that in all the changes which I see as being contemplated for the Established Church, I observe all for evil, and none for good. I recognize in the hollow, undermining, destructive friendship of the Whig—in the taunting hatred of the Infidel—in the faithless, oath-breaking malice of the Papist, a desire to leave the Irish Church, if suffered to exist as a Church at all, encumbered with all the corruptions which her connection with the State engendered,* while her capabilities of doing good

* How different are the state and prospects of the two Established Churches of Ireland and Scotland; while the former, to all human appearance, is about to have her tent struck and her lines removed, the latter, having a recovering principle, instinct with life within herself, and quickened into vigour by the attacks of her enemies, is lengthening its cords and strengthening its stakes. The venerable Assembly of the Church of Scotland has just passed a vote, by which the abuses of patronage, so long complained of, which were the main causes of dissent, are removed. In future the nomination of the

are to be crippled, all her future expansiveness mutilated, and her capability of self-adjustment destroyed; and so, though she may, in Whig mercy, be allowed to drag on a degraded existence a little longer, she will remain in her abasement, shorn of her virtues, defiled with her vices; like Sampson grovelling in the house of Dagon, blind and bald, a standing butt for all who would exercise on her, and, *at the same time, justify* their hearts' malignity. Oh, Sir, how from my inmost soul I have execrated the shallow glozing hypocrisy of those who have pretended, in their speeches against the Church, to pity, and exclaimed that justice should be done to—the curates of the Irish Church! Yes, even O'Connell had the face to whine over the hardships and the wrongs of us stipendiaries; but soon the faithlessness of this *Vanè Ligur*, as well as that of Messrs. Faithful, Hume, Ward, &c. became apparent, when, in order to smooth the way for church robbery, they spoke of respecting the existing and vested rights of bishops, dignitaries, and rectors; but they never talked of protecting the vested rights of curates—of men who, after expending money, time, labour, literature, and devotedness, in arriving at the clerical profession—after raising the character of the Established Irish Church in the face of Christendom, for the curates are they that have mainly done it—are to be, according to their plan, cut off from hope, and consigned to that cruellest of all sentences—let him that is dependent be dependent still. Thus, Sir, while the relatives and creatures of the Prime Minister, and the sons of Chancellors, and of Peers and Prelates, together with this *hoc genus omne*, are (in order to bribe them down in acquiescence) to have their vested rights protected, and to enjoy loaves and fishes all their life long, 700 curates, who are in the Church, and 1,000 young men, who (at an expence of money which few could spare, and of time which never can be redeemed) have prepared themselves for the clerical profession—all these are given to understand that they must cease to hope, and must suffer under the transition, when the introduction of a new machinery supersedes their labour and their possibility of independence. Were I not aware, Mr. Examiner, how much State influence has paralyzed the organization and healthy energy of the the Irish Church, I should feel astonished at the apathy and apparent neglect of their vital interests exhibited by the inferior clergy in this crisis. But again, I said to myself, “Poor fellows, what can they do? what can I do? what can Vicar John or Curate Peter do?” Their Bishops; who are now-a-days *the Church*, and **THE WHOLE CHURCH**, have done nothing, and seem intent on doing nothing; who seem to hate convocations and synods as much as the Popes did general coun-

patron will not take effect, if the majority of the parishioners, being heads of families in full communion with the church, should object to the appointment. In this case the patron must make a new appointment, still subject to the same power on the part of the parishioners.

cils—have set their faces against any deliberative meetings, and thus they give occasion to many to suspect that they are more afraid of their own clergy, than of the Papists, Whigs, and Radicals; and many, therefore, say, but surely without truth, that some Bishops would bear to see the Church, as far as man can do it, extinguished, rather than run the risk of having it restored to its original deliberative polity.

And here let us consider, for a while, the state in which this parliamentary inquisition will find the Church, and the report the inquisitors are likely to give in, and the final result of their investigation.

And first, they will find a Church whose Clergy have, for three centuries, been successively plundered by the laity, by King, Lords, and Commons—by Crown alienations—by prelatical appropriations—by lordly plunder, and legislative spoliation. They will find a body of ecclesiastics suffering under the bad name which two centuries of abused state influence have called down on their heads—they will find a most unequal and mischievous division of parochial duty imposed on the Clergy, in consequence of Irish Parliamentary enactments, and of lay impropriation and injustice. They will find ministers seated where they need not be, and ministers wanting where their services are loudly called for—they will find altogether wanting an adjusting capability in church machinery, whereby faults might be corrected, wants supplied, and obstacles removed—they will find the acknowledged vice of pluralities thus made defensible, and a handle given for nepotism and corrupt state influence. They will find rectors where there should be vicars, and vicars where there should be rectors—a rich incumbent where there are few souls to save, and a poor minister where there are thousands whose souls and bodies are he ministered unto, and who should be the dispenser of charity when, in fact, and if the truth was known, he was, and should be an object of charity himself. All this, and more than this they will find; and they will ascertain that there is not more than £600,000 a-year to be divided amongst 2,000 clergymen; and they will see that the Protestant landed proprietors of Ireland, instead of having a right to put three-fourths of this income into their own pockets, by the extinction of tithes, have every reason, both in justice and policy, to pay this sum cheerfully to a Protestant Clergy. Will they therefore report that all the evils of the existing Church of Ireland, though many, are yet remediable; that her property is not too large, but that it is badly divided; that her parochial divisions are faulty, and should be newly arranged; that her tithe system is oppressive, and should be commuted; that her patronage is corrupt, and that therefore wholesome and prudential checks should be placed over its future exercise; that the inferior clergy, though badly paid, need and ask for no other change than the *assured* prospect (which now they have not) of being in future provided for *according to their merit*; and, finally,

will they report that, though Ireland has not been Protestantized or educated as it should be, that the fault lay *not* with the Clergy, but THE STATE—not with the parsons, but the owners of confiscated estates? And, if ignorance is in the land, if disaffection is in the land, if Popery is in the land, let the invading swordsmen, and not the missionary gownsman bear the blame: let the jealous penal laws, that rubric of the statute-book, imprinted under fear and wrath, in order to preserve conquered lands, bear the blame; let the avaricious non-agistment enactment bear the blame; let the forty-shilling franchise bear the blame. Let the Commissioners so report to their employers.

Moreover, after they have gone through the length and breadth of the land, let them report, as they will observe, how active and painstaking the parochial clergy are; how in all ecclesiastical history there is scarce an instance of a clergy having improved so much in doctrine and practice as those of the Established Church of Ireland; how peaceable, orderly, loyal, and comparatively religious are their flocks; how effectually they are instructed to fear God and honor the King, and not meddle with those that are given to change. Let them then contrast Protestants with Papists, and weigh well their respective characters as subjects and Christians, and then let them, if they dare, before God and the King recommend that the Protestant Church of Ireland should be disembodied, or its staff so reduced as to lose the power of recruiting for the future, and re-conquering Ireland from all the evils, religious, moral, and political, that are involved in that ONE WORD, *POPERY*.

But is this really the report our Commissioners are likely to give? I fear not. I apprehend that those who hold, that they may apply our Church property to secular purposes, will take care to employ men who will report as those who are looking for grounds of accusation, rather than for pleas of justification.

God defend the Church, I say, from the tender mercies of expectant and briefless barristers, *Greculi (quere, Greyii) esurientes*—the *employees* of this centralizing and commission-creating Whig Government. Oh, what do I anticipate from their *dispassionate* questioning, the calm, equitable summing up of evidence, when parson, priest, parish-clerks, and chapel-clerks, churchwardens and confraternity men, monks, friars, and sisters of charity, shall be paraded before these Commissioners. And then, what effects must result to Protestantism while these inquisitions are being made! What a process of intimidation, bullying, lying, and perjury, will go on, when it is the conviction of every priest and popish bigot in Ireland, and by them impressed on the population, that it will serve the cause of the Catholic church that Protestants should be made scarce in the respective parishes of the island. Where Protestants are married to Papists what an urging there will be, by force or fraud, to the Mass-house; what warnings will be given to all heretics, who lie under thatched roofs, to pack up, and be off for Canada!

But, Sir, I must pursue this train of thought no further: you may, from what I have said, clearly perceive, that I anticipate no other report from these officials than one injurious and fatal to the Church, as an Establishment; and I hold that the end of all will be, that Protestantism, as an Establishment, will be withdrawn from the rural parishes of Munster, Connaught, and Leinster; that the clergy of the larger towns will remain so far established as to receive, like the Presbyterian ministers of Down and Antrim, a "Regium donum," and that Popery will seek to establish itself by force or fraud, as heretofore, in Ireland. But will this succeed? It may, for a time—but not long. The schoolmaster is abroad—the Satanic schoolmaster, and the time is coming, and Doctor Doyle, before he died, saw it, when education, which carries in its hand the word of man and not the word of God—education, that gives to man an enlarged heart to conceive, and a third hand to perpetrate—mischief, will batter at the bulwarks of priestcraft, and the priests that have hallooed on infidelity, to the subversion of rational Christianity, will find that, as death is the son, and at the same time slayer of sin, so unbelief, the child of misbelief, will, in the end, with bitter mockery, even while laughing, commit murder on its mother.

In the meantime, though the members of a true Christian Church may wish the downfall of the mother of abominations, and the bane of our own beautiful land—though he may exclaim, when contemplating all the mischiefs she has caused—*Exoriatu aliquis*—yet he cannot desire that one evil should be removed by substituting a worse, and a bad spirit expelled by Beelzebub. But he *may* pray, and he *ought* to pray, and he *does* pray, that Popery may be driven out and exorcised by the preaching of the Everlasting Gospel; and especially and fondly he desires that this Gospel may be *still* held in the reformed hands of the Established Church, which, recovered from her incumbering abuses, and relieved from all the evils which hitherto have beset her spiritual, militant, and missionary efficiency, shall go forth like David when divested of Saul's armour, with weapons that are not carnal, with sling and pebble-stone, to face and to overthrow Goliath, and all that were born to the giant.

As I have been, Sir, so in all likelihood I shall remain,

Your obedient Servant, and

A PERPETUAL CURATE.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

POPULAR SUPERSTITIONS IN IRELAND.

(From the Protestant Journal.)

THE BED OF THE HOLY GHOST.

THE isles of Arran are situated off the west coast of Ireland, at the entrance of the bay of Galway. The largest of them was highly famous during the iron age of Popery, and contains several spots of high and far-famed Romish sanctity. On its north side stood a large convent, where three hundred students are said to have lodged; and near this, clustered together on one point, were seven churches. Amid the tiny traces of one of these is an object of reputed miraculous virtue, and of superstitious and awful veneration—the *bed of the Holy Ghost*. This is a depression in the green sward, somewhat in the shape of a grave, and about a foot in depth. The Romish people currently believe it to possess the extraordinary property of contracting or expanding in breadth and length, so as to become exactly commensurate with whatever man, woman, or child, lies down on it to obtain a miraculous cure. Persons are believed to be cured of all sorts of diseases by sleeping on this bed three successive nights in the open air. The very stones in its vicinity are supposed to possess many of its highly supernatural virtues, and as sanative and valuable relics, are in great request throughout Connaught, and even in distant parts of Ireland.

Were the bosoms of Connaughtmen laid bare, there would be seen resting on the breasts of thousands, the holy stones of Arran, suspended as preservatives against witchcraft, the blast of fairies, power of demons, and the influence of contagion and bodily distempers. The stones are of a species of slate, and, for "pious uses" are usually struck off in pieces about two inches square, with the all-pervading "mark of the beast" scratched on them. Not a few "pil-

grims" and "voteens" conduct a kind of trade in these precious commodities; and wherever they show themselves among the poor and middling classes, they are received, simply on account of the stones, as holy men, and special servants of God, and are often well paid in money for a gift of one of the holy relics.

ST. KURAN'S LOUGH.

In the vicinity of Tarlough, county Mayo, is a small lake, called the Lough of St. Kuran. The patron saint of it is famous among the country people for his power over the diseases and dangers of the inferior animals. Persons from all parts continually resort to the lake, to obtain benefits for their cattle. When anything goes amiss with their cows, or mares, or sheep, the simple peasantry place more faith on a pilgrimage to Lough Kuran, than if all the skill of living man, and the whole world of ordinary and natural remedies were placed at their command. They seldom approach the saint without an offering, and this usually consists of a *roll of butter*, which the hapless creatures toss into the lough. Rolls of butter thrown into the lake are thought both to propitiate Saint Kuran, if he be displeased, and to procure from him whatever positive benefits are desired. Thousands of the Connaught peasants may be seen presenting their offerings, and performing their devotions around the lake, to deliver their cattle from sickness and danger. Do not these miserable beings deny that there is a God above? and are they not trained to deny and set aside his providence? In what are they superior, or rather, how very much are they inferior, to the "Rammaken" of the pagan hordes of Southern Africa? The neighbouring priests could put an end to their humiliating superstition, almost by the speaking of a word; yet they *do not interfere*.

SUPERSTITIONS IN CONNAUGHT.

If any one be injured by an evil eye, and the priest does not cure it, he must get the person who has the evil eye to say, "God bless you," and afterwards to spit on him: but if he refuses, get a piece of his coat, boil it in water, and let the sick drink it; or if this cannot be obtained, the person must be watched till he is seen to spit on the ground, and let the saliva, with the dirt, be taken and applied in any manner, and the sick will recover.

Five candles must be lit over a corpse. The candle ends of these are of great value, and are zealously sought, carried away, and preserved, as they cause good luck in life, and a repentant and happy death. A piece of the winding-sheet, and especially the corner, is highly lucky, and brings great advantages to whoever possesses it.

Better dream of the devil than of a priest. If a priest enter a house, unless officially, it is highly unlucky. If washing, or any other manual labour be going forward when a priest enters, you can escape certain calamity only by getting him, either to breathe on the work, or to perform a part of it with his own hands. The money of a priest is peculiarly unlucky, and no good can ever come of it, as it is the *price of sin*. It will always melt away, and bring nothing but evil on whoever inherits or possesses it. If you buy corn-seed with it, it will either be blighted, or not grow; if you purchase cattle with it they will die; if you mix it with other money, all will melt away, and none of it will ever do any good.

in going from house to house, and from room to room, reading the Holy Scriptures, speaking of the love of God, and declaring the forgiveness of sin through the name of Jesus only—circulating the Holy Scriptures and religious tracts—directing and encouraging the people to a regular attendance at places of public worship—sending children to Sunday and Daily Schools, and recommending to the attention of the benevolent the case of those who, through sickness or want of employment, are reduced to circumstances of real distress. The average number of families visited every month is more than 2000, about 1000 of which are Roman Catholic. Thus are the labours of this Society auxiliary to almost all the religious and benevolent institutions in the city; beside which an opportunity is afforded through means of the General Agent (who visits the hospitals and prisons), of sending the glad tidings of salvation to the sick and dying in any part of the city.

Many poor families of Protestants have been found by the agents of this Society, in such obscurity and wretchedness as completely excluded them from the ordinary means of grace; they were unknown and unvisited until visited by these messengers of a Saviour's love.

There remain seven districts of the thirty-one into which the city is divided, yet to be supplied with missionaries; which the managers, in dependence upon the Lord's blessing, have determined to fill up, as soon as suitable persons can be found; knowing that the hearts of all men are at his disposal, and that the silver and the gold are his.

DUBLIN CITY MISSION.

THIS Society was established in June, 1828. Its object is to extend the knowledge of the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ amongst the poor of this city.

For this purpose twenty-five missionaries are now employed, who spend from five to six hours each day

Sir R. SHAW, Bart. and Co.
Treasurers.

W. C. HOGAN, Esq. 48, York-street,
Rev. W. B. KIRKPATRICK, 71, Eccles-
street, *Secretaries.*

Mr. W. J. STOKES;
Assistant Secretary.

Office of the Society, 16, Upper
Sackville-street.

NAVAL AND MILITARY BIBLE SOCIETY.

This society held its fifty-fourth anniversary in London during the last month; and though we have felt deeply interested in the many valuable details presented to the public by the different religious societies that assembled about the same period, there was none which so completely won upon our feelings as the following lucid, forcible, and affecting statement of Captain Gordon, illustrative of the beneficial influence of religion upon the army. Any comment of ours is unnecessary, and might be misconstrued: we shall not, therefore, attempt to engraft our ideas on a subject already treated in a masterly manner:—

“The regiment of the Sutherland Highlanders came all from nearly the same locality: they were men deeply saturated with the principles of the Reformation, before they entered the regiment; and it was a fact, he believed, not paralleled by the case of any other regiment in the service, that there were 600 men regular communicants belonging to it. A non-commissioned officer belonging to the regiment, from whom he got this information, a brave fellow, who had lost his leg in the service, and who was, when he knew him, living as a schoolmaster, assured him that these 600 men of the regiment received the communion whenever they could get round the table of the Lord. He added, that of these 600 cases he did not think there were twelve doubtful; that is, that he did not believe there were twelve of that number who did not receive the communion in the spirit of sincerity and truth. That was the religious character of the regiment. He might add, that when the regiment was on the Cape station, and about to take their departure for another part of the world, they contributed £140 to the Missionary Society there, as a parting gift, and a testimony of their approbation of missionary labours. The men had, by their joint contribution, established a fund for the education of the children belonging

to the regiment; not one shilling was contributed by any commissioned officer; and that fund was not only found sufficient to provide amply for the education of the children, but also to supply the means of putting many of them out afterwards as apprentices, and, beyond that, to assist some who were orphans, in getting into business. They had another fund for the relief of widows belonging to the regiment; and it was found sufficient to keep them in comfort. Besides this, it was the practice, that, when a man was leaving the regiment, the men should each contribute one day's pay as a parting gift; and this amounted to between £60 and £70. For eleven years there was not one instance of corporal punishment in the regiment; and for seven years of that time the regiment was commanded by a rigid martinet, who would not have overlooked any, even the slightest, relaxation of discipline: nay more, it would have been more grievous to any one of those soldiers to have received a censure or a reprimand from the superior officers, than it would have been to others to receive corporal punishment. They not only abstained from doing that which was wrong from a sense of moral rectitude, but also from a feeling of deep religious consistency. They were on one occasion reviewed by a distinguished officer in the presence of the Duke of York, then Commander-in-Chief, with whom this officer afterwards dined; when he said to the Duke that it was a great injustice to the rest of the service not to break up this regiment into small detachments, and divide them among other regiments, for that there was not one man in it who did not deserve, and was not fit, to be a non-commissioned officer. Now for the courage of this psalm-singing regiment, as some in derision would no doubt call it—that courage, as it was displayed by that excellent set of men, was a strong illustration of the truth, that those who feared God feared no one else. The regiment was sent out of this country to America, and was engaged in the fatal battle of New Orleans. On that

occasion they were attacked by a dense column of the enemy, four deep, securely intrenched behind walls; the destruction of the British forces was tremendous: but while some of the troops who had advanced with them to the attack fled to the right and to the left, the brave Highlanders stood their ground; and an officer told him, that such was the determination of that regiment, and the unwillingness to turn their back on the enemy, that, though the slaughter amongst them was immense, and there was no hope of forcing the enemy from their position, many of them were actually pulled off the field by their officers, who were thus obliged to use force to bring them to the right about. The contest, however, was not of long duration; for the destruction was so rapid, that nearly two-thirds of that brave regiment fell on the spot on which they had stood; and their death was in every way worthy of the Christian warrior; for while many of them lay on the ground, mortally wounded, they raised their voices in union with many of their comrades, who were similarly stretched near them, and died singing the praises of God. An order had been made, when the regiment was marching up, that they should take no luggage with them. That order, however, they disobeyed so far as that every man took his pocket Bible; and many of them, while lying bleeding and dying on the fatal field, might be seen earnestly intent on the sacred volume, and many drew their last breath with it firmly clasped in their hands. Would not this sketch—for it was only a brief sketch of what he could state with respect to that regiment—would not, he repeated, that sketch be sufficient to convince any one who might have been sceptical on the point, that the Bible-reading soldier was not diminished in moral worth by the study of that sacred volume, and the observance of its pure principles; and that to impress soldiers strongly with Christian truths, to bring them under the influence of the love of Christ, would be to place an impenetrable shield between the country and its enemies?"

DOCTOR DOYLE.

THIS distinguished individual died on Sunday, 15th June, at his residence, Carlow. For some time past his death had been expected, and various reports were circulated regarding the unsettled state of his mind on religious subjects; what tends to confirm these reports is, that his illness was looked upon with the most apathetic feelings by the Popish party; and we have reason to believe that he disliked exceedingly the presence of those spiritual comforters who crowded around him. It would be indeed surprising to imagine that so vigorous an understanding as he possessed could be fettered by the trammels of Popery. We hope sincerely that something besides its cold formalities cheered him in his exit from this world, and that the light of Gospel truth illuminated the dark valley of the shadow of death. As our maxim is, *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*, we shall not disturb his ashes by calling up the evils he has inflicted on his country in judgment against him.

FOREIGN.

NOTICES CONCERNING CHINA.

THE Chinese believe that the population of the eighteen provinces into which their country is divided, in the year 1812, amounted to 360,279,897; but the accuracy of their calculations may be justly doubted.

Whatever may be the exact amount of its population, the empire presents a grand spectacle for contemplation, and a vast field for philanthropic and commercial enterprise. If the Christian merchant and teacher will come and occupy the field which is opening before them, and with the spirit to do to others as each would have others do to him, new relations with China, and a better interest in her behalf, must soon exist. The peculiar position and temper of this nation should not damp and repress generous feeling, and benevolent action. Man has a right to claim fellowship with his fellow-man. The Chinese themselves, on the authority of their own sages, have maintained that *the whole world is one family*; and that, of course, mutual intercourse ought

to be cultivated; but in practice they utterly renounce this principle, and have long stood aloof from the great family of nations. In this attitude they have become proud, selfish, and exclusive. Notwithstanding all this, the merchant has not ceased to obtain the richest productions of their soil, and to furnish them with a liberal exchange of commodities. Here the traffic has ceased. No reciprocity of feeling, no intercourse of thought, no exchange of friendly sentiments, has been encouraged or allowed. Thus the bonds of brotherhood have been sundered, and mutual hostilities generated and perpetuated.

What then shall be done? Is China to be abandoned for ever? In present circumstances it is difficult to say definitely what line of conduct ought to be pursued. If Christian philanthropists should feel as deep an interest in the intellectual and moral character of China as they do, and with good reason, in her commercial relations, ways and means enough could be devised for benefitting this people. Greece has had her advocates, who, from the pulpit and the press, and in the halls of legislation and public assembly, have pleaded nobly for them. Poland, too, and other states, have elicited the generous exertions of philanthropic men. But where have been the like exhibited in behalf of China? She disdains such friendly offices. And what then? Is she all that she claims to be? Because the lunatic fancies himself a king, is he to be regarded as such? Does this empire present no claims on heaven-born charity? Are there here no miseries to be relieved? no dark and cruel superstitions to be chased away? "Yes," answers the voice of Christian philanthropy; and inquires, "What shall be done?" We would reply, "Cultivate an acquaintance with her; study her character; learn her language; not so much with a view of deriving riches or honour from the acquisition, as for the sake of conveying knowledge to her inhabitants." Great numbers of her sons can read; and there is, to a considerable extent, a *taste* for reading among

the Chinese: but most of their popular books are light and trivial; many of them are low, and obscene in the extreme; and not a few of their sacred books are meagre, and most positively bad. Now, to open to all the inhabitants of this great empire the exhaustless treasures of revealed truth, and to furnish them with a new literature, enriched with all the improvements of modern science, requires cooperation among the friends of China. The work is vast, and thousands may join in it.

The Chinese visit the tombs twice a-year, in spring and in autumn. The first time is called *ting ming*, "clear bright," referring to the fine weather which is then expected. The second is called *tsow tsie*, "the autumnal sacrifice." The rites performed during the *ting-ming* season are the most generally attended to by the Chinese. Their governors teach that the prosperity of individuals and families depends greatly on the circumstances of a parent's grave; as its position, its being dry or damp, its being in good external repair, &c. Therefore to "sweep" and repair them, to mark their limits, and see that they are not encroached upon by others, are objects of the visits to the tombs. When there are large clans, which have descended from the same ancestors, living in the same neighbourhood, they repair in great numbers to the performance of the sacrificial rites. Rich and poor all assemble. Even beggars repair to the tombs, to kneel down and worship. This usage is known by the phrases, "sweeping the tombs," and "worshipping the tumuli." To omit these observances, is considered a great offence against moral propriety, and a breach of filial duty. The common belief is, that good fortune, domestic prosperity, honours and riches, all depend on an impulse given at the tombs of ancestors. Hence the practice is universal; and when the men are absent from their families, the women go to perform their rites.

It appears that there are in China upwards of one thousand five hundred and sixty temples dedicated to

Confucius. At the spring and autumnal sacrifices offered to him, it is calculated that there are immolated on the two occasions annually, six bullocks, twenty-seven thousand pigs, five thousand eight hundred sheep, two thousand eight hundred deer, and twenty-seven thousand rabbits. Thus there are annually sacrificed to Confucius in China, sixty-two thousand six hundred and six victims; and it is also stated that there are offered, at the same time twenty-seven thousand and six hundred pieces of silk. What becomes of these does not appear. We here see even the learned, in one of the most enlightened modern heathen nations pay divine honours to a fellow-creature, who is universally acknowledged by them to have been a mere man!

As a specimen of the eagerness with which the Chinese receive Christian books, the following extracts from Mr. Gutzlaff's journal may be given:—

It has always been my anxious desire to give medical help whenever it was practicable. However, the sufferers are so numerous, that we are able to assist only a very small portion of the number. I should recommend it to a missionary about to enter China, to make himself perfectly acquainted with the diseases of the eye. He cannot be too learned in the ophthalmic science; for ophthalmia is more frequent here than in any part of the world. This arises from a peculiar curved structure of the eye, which is generally very small, and often inflamed by inverted eye-lids. Often while dealing out eye-water to a great extent, and successively examining the eyes, I have wished to establish a hospital in the centre of the empire, in some place easy of access by sea and land. I know scarcely one instance of a clever medical man having given himself up to the service of this distant nation, with the view of promoting the glorious Gospel, and the happiness of his fellow-men. There have been several gentlemen, both at Macao and Canton, whose praiseworthy endeavours

to alleviate suffering have been crowned with much success. Yet we want an hospital in the heart of China itself; and we want men who wish to live solely for the cause.

When I first went on shore at Ketow, the people were distrustful of receiving the word of salvation. Some of them hinted that our books merely contained the doctrines of western barbarians, which were quite at variance with the tenets of the Chinese sages. I did not undertake to contest this point with them, but proceeded to administer relief to a poor man who was almost blind. He was affected with this unexpected kindness, and, turning towards me, said, "Judging from your actions, your doctrines must be excellent; therefore, I beseech you, give me some of your books. Though I cannot myself read, I have children who can." From this moment the demand for the word of God increased, so that I could never pass a hamlet without being importuned by the people to impart to them the knowledge of divine things. In the wide excursions which I took, I daily witnessed their demand for the word of God. The greatest favour we could bestow upon the natives was to give them a book; which, as a precious relic, was treasured up and kept for the perusal of all their acquaintances and friends.

At a distance, the island of Poo-to appeared barren and scarcely habitable; but as we approached it, we observed very prominent buildings and large glittering domes. A temple built upon a projecting rock, beneath which the foaming sea dashed, gave us some idea of the genius of its inhabitants, in thus selecting the most attractive spot to celebrate the orgies of idolatry. We were quite engaged in viewing a large building situate in a grove, when we observed some priests of Budha walking along the shore, attracted by the novel sight of a ship. Scarcely had we landed, when another party of priests, in common garb, and very filthy, hastened down to us, chanting hymns. When some books were offered them, they exclaimed, 'Praise be to

Budha;" and eagerly took every volume that I had. We then ascended to a large temple surrounded by trees and bamboo. An elegant portal and magnificent gate brought us into a large court, which was surrounded with a long row of buildings, not unlike barracks; but the dwellings of the priests. On entering it, the huge image of Budha and his disciples, the representations of Kwan-yin, the goddess of mercy, and other deformed idols, with the spacious and well-adorned halls, exhibit an imposing sight to the foreign spectator. With what feelings ought a missionary to be impressed when he sees so great a nation under the abject control of disgusting idolatry! Whilst walking here, I was strongly reminded of St. Paul in Athens, when he was passing among the temples, and saw an altar dedicated "To the Unknown God." For here we also found both a small hall, and an altar covered with white cloth, allotted to the same purpose. I addressed the priests, who followed us in crowds; for several hundreds belong to this temple. They gave the assent of indifference to my sayings, and fixed their whole attention upon the examination of our clothes. It was satisfactory, however, to see that the major and intelligent part of them were so eagerly reading our books, that they could not find a few moments even to look at us. The treatise which pleased them most was a dialogue between Chang and Yuen, the one a Christian, and the other an ignorant heathen. This work of the late much-lamented Dr. Milne contains very pointed and just remarks, and has always been a favourite book among Chinese readers.

The High Priest requested an interview. He was an old, deaf man, who seemed to have very little authority; and his remarks were common-place enough. Though the people seemed to be greatly embarrassed at our unexpected appearance, their apprehensions gradually subsided: meanwhile we had the pleasure of seeing our ship coming to anchor in the roads. Having, therefore, renewed my stock of books with a larger store, I went again on shore. At this time the demand was much

greater; and I was almost overwhelmed by the number of priests who ran down upon us, earnestly begging at least a short tract, of which I had taken great quantities with me. I was very soon stripped of all, and had to refuse numerous applications.

We afterwards followed a paved road, and on a sudden came in sight of a large temple with yellow tiles, by which we immediately recognised it as imperial.

This temple was built several centuries ago (about 550), but it has undergone great repairs. It was erected to emblazon the glorious deeds of the goddess of mercy, who is said to have honoured this spot with her presence. We were told that upon a spot not exceeding twelve square miles (for this appears to be the extent of the island) two thousand priests were living. To maintain this numerous train of idlers, lands on the opposite island have been allotted for their use, which they farm out; but as this is still inadequate, they go upon begging expeditions, not only into the surrounding provinces, but even as far as Siam. From its being a place of pilgrimage also, the priests derive great profits. Many rich persons, and especially successful Captains, repair thither to express their gratitude, and spend their money in this delightful spot.

In order to satisfy my mind respecting the founding of a depository for Scriptures and tracts in one of the temples, I took my station in the great hall which leads into the large temple. At this time I had taken the precaution of guarding my back by the wall, that I might not be thrown down by the crowd. Within a few minutes the priests thronged around me. Though they were urgent, they behaved politely, and begged, almost with tears, that I would give them a few tracts. How joyfully did they retire with the books under their arms.

Thus we passed many days here; and the demand for the word of God, not indeed *as such*, but as being a new doctrine, increased daily more and more.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
AND
Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXXIV. AUGUST, 1834. Vol. III.

A SERMON.*

PREACHED, MAY 23, 1830, AT ST. PETER'S CHURCH, FOR THE FEMALE ORPHANS.

“For they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ.”—1 COR. x. 4.

FROM this, as well as from other passages of Scripture, it appears that the effects of that stupendous miracle, by which Moses brought forth water out of the rock at Horeb, continued with the Israelites during the greater part of their sojournings in the wilderness. There are some who imagine, according to the strictly literal meaning of this passage, that the rock itself, out of which the water flowed, was, by the exercise of a continual miracle, always present in their camp. Others, with more probability, that, by a common figure of speech, the rock is here put for the water which issued from it, and that a constant stream flowed from the original source, and followed, or rather accompanied (for so the original word imports) the Israelites through their various wanderings.

In what strict sense that rock was Christ, I do not undertake to explain. But considering how, from the commencement,

* Aware how deservedly popular the Rev. H. Woodward is as a preacher, and what large congregations he drew on his recent occupation of some of our Dublin pulpits, we have requested his permission to print this sermon as our leading article for the present number. The subject is confessedly occasional; but if, by giving a wider circulation to this discourse, we can in any way enlist public opinion more largely in favour of one of the best managed and most interesting charities in Ireland, we humbly trust we shall not be considered idle or careless in our editorial vocation.—ED.

the entire system of the Old Testament, in all its institutions, its sacrifices, its ceremonial observances, its history, and its memorable characters—how all prefigured and centered in Christ, there is something very remarkable and significant in the declaration of my text. It shows how, even under that darker dispensation, Christ was embodied in the whole economy of the Jews; how sensibly he was brought near to them; how he entered into the system of their daily habits; how his presence was around them and amongst them; how the place on which they stood was holy ground; how every ordinary action had, in some sense, a sacred and religious character. Even their daily food had something sacramental in it: "They did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ."

If Christ was thus all in all under the older covenant, it follows that he must be so, with still brighter manifestation, under the more perfect dispensation of the Gospel; and that we upon whom the Sun of Righteousness has risen, are still more immediately and intensely acted on, encircled and pervaded by his presence and his Spirit.

The whole system, then, in which we live has this sacred stamp upon it; so much so, that often, in our dealings and intercourse with the persons and objects that are around us, we are really and virtually concerned with, and acting, though perhaps unconsciously, in relation to Christ.

Thus, for example, when our Saviour sends forth his Apostles, he addresses them in these words: "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me." And to so awful an extent is the majesty of his presence embodied, as it were, in their commission, that he thus fearfully denounces those who will not receive them: "Verily, I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gommorrah, in the day of judgment, than for that city." Again, in the instance of St. Paul's conversion: while in ignorance and unbelief, he made havoc of the church, and thought that he was doing God service; in the midst of this career of bigotry and false zeal, he hears a voice, saying unto him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" His eyes are then opened, and he perceives, for the first time, what had been the real object of his hostility. The whole system he was vainly labouring to put down bore the marks of the Lord Jesus. Every wound he inflicted, was inflicted upon Christ. Every contempt he poured upon the truth—every trembling sufferer he haled to prison and to death—all was persecution of the Son of God.

The whole church, of which we are, at least, visible and professing members, is, in Scripture language, described, in some peculiar sense, as Christ himself. Thus, in Eph. i. 22, 23, God is said to have given him "to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in

all." And in the second chapter, it is declared, "ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord." Again, in the fifth chapter: "No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church." Many other passages might be quoted from the same apostle, in which the church is termed the body of Christ, meaning thereby that it is a society of which he is the head—through which his vitalizing influence flows—distributed, as from the natural head, throughout the whole body; a society bearing the same relation to Christ that the branches do to the vine; that is, essentially connected, incorporated, and identified with him—one with Christ, and Christ with it.

And as the collective body of Christians is thus mystically united to the Saviour, so is each Christian separately and individually. "For we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones." "Know ye not," says the same apostle, "that Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" And of himself he declares, that "to him to live is Christ;" that it is not *he* that lives, but Christ that liveth in him; for "the life," says he, "which I now in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."

In the two sacraments of the Christian church, we perceive, also, how Christ leavens the whole lump. Baptism signifies our being mystically grafted into Christ. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." In the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, also, this great truth is strikingly apparent. To what degree, or in what special manner, our Lord is present in the memorials of his passion, has been, as you are well aware, the subject of endless controversy. It is enough for our immediate purpose to know, from his own words, that in some spiritual and sacramental sense, always to be devoutly, though not superstitiously acknowledged, the elements of the communion are Christ. "Take eat, this is my body." "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins."

Now, the practical conclusion which I would draw from all this is the same as St. Peter draws, when he contemplates the awful conflagration of the earth: "What manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness." We live and move and have our being in a system and scheme of things which Christ thus intensely acts upon, and intimately pervades; where all is, in a certain sense, baptized into his name; where all is brought into covenant with him; where holiness unto the Lord is written upon every thing great and small; where nothing can be desecrated, without trampling on the blood of Christ; where sin

is not a venial offence against a being such as natural light discovers; but stands forth detected, in the blaze of Scripture truth, as the transgression of the eternal law—as the breach of the everlasting covenant—as crucifying the Son of God afresh, and putting him to an open shame.

Some would, perhaps, palliate this matter by supposing that they are not accountable in so strict a sense. They would pay what they consider due respect and homage to their Lord and Saviour; but to come into such close bonds as these—to associate his presence with every scene and place they go to—to view all around them as, in some sense, breathing the spirit, and stamped with the superscription of Christ—to live thus within sacred inclosures, and in a region of holiness—these are responsibilities which they have not voluntarily undertaken, and for which they feel, therefore, that they are not accountable. But this is mere delusion. We were not God's counsellors, when the Father gave to the great Mediator all power in heaven and in earth; nor was it left to us to choose whether we should be born in a land of darkness, or in a Christian country. However heathens may be dealt with, as out of covenant with Christ, and to a certain extent excusable in their ignorance, yet no Christian can thus plead in bar of judgment. It is, alas, most true that, in one sense, the false professor is out of covenant with Christ. The benefits and the blessings of the covenant are not his. But all the responsibilities of the covenant are his. And it is a most awful consideration to all such impenitent sinners, that no power in heaven or in earth can extricate them from their engagements to God. As members of the visible church, they are dedicated to God. Whenever they sin, they defile the temple of God. Those bodies which they steep in sensuality and pollution are the members of Christ. Is there any one who bears the form of man who would not shrink with horror at the thought of abusing the wine which is consecrated at the Lord's Supper, to the purposes of debauchery and intoxication? Remember, then, that whenever you commit a wilful sin, you profane and desecrate something holier than a sacrament; you pollute that for whose use and service sacraments were instituted or ordained; you defile your own immortal spirit, the image of God, and the purchase of the Redeemer's blood—that soul which, if not in a good sense, is yet in a bad sense, with every conceivable aggravation of its guilt, one with Christ, and Christ with it.

I well know that when men's minds are estranged from God they have some kind of horror at what they consider in religion as too spiritual, too remote from their experience, too foreign from their natural feelings. The light appears too dazzling. It meets their eyes like the unwelcome visit of the morning to one whose senses are steeped in slumber—who feels it a violence to his whole nature to rise up and find himself amidst the glare and activities of the day. All this proceeds from the disease of sin, which blinds the eye and impairs the native apprehensions of the soul.

But do we even desire a cure for this distemper? If we do this sincerely—however faltering and faint our wishes—yet if they be sincere, we are then in the way to find and to experience that Christ's being near us in all things is not a terror and a distress, but the most unspeakable blessing.

Do we feel the weight of guilt? Do we see our danger and our lost estate? Do we acknowledge the justice of our condemnation, and do we tremble before an offended God? Amidst these terrors of the soul, Christ is not far from us. Let us believe on the Lord Jesus, and, lo! he stands before us as the bleeding victim of our sins—as a hiding place from the storm—as our peace with God—our new and living way into the holiest.

Or do we labour, not so much under a sense of guilt, as under the weight and misery of an unhappy mind? Is wounded pride, anxious care, pining sorrow, bitter disappointment,—is some heavy burden pressing down the soul, and preying upon the very root of life? In these deep waters Christ is not slow to save; he is a present help in all these troubles. "Come unto me," says he, "all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Or do we draw near to the valley of the shadow of death, and, with awful interest, seek to descry what regions lie beyond it? Here again, to the eye of faith, the Lord of Life appears, and at the gates of death and of the unseen world, cheers us with these words: "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and he that believeth in me, shall never die."

Such are the consolations and the mercies of God in Christ. Have you, my brethren, accepted them? Or, if not, will you accept them now? I offer them on the authority of God—freely offer them to you all, without money and without price. And remember that, on the great principle laid down in this discourse, it is Christ himself who entreats you through the messenger who now addresses you; and that hearing the invitations of his ministers, you hear him. Remember also (and, oh! with what prostrate reverence of all that is within us should we think of it) that Christ, that gracious Lamb, who died for you on the cross; that God whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain; that he is now present in this assembly, according to his own covenant and promise. "For where two or three are gathered together," says he, "in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Shall he, then, stand by and hear me plead for God and for your own souls in vain!

The leading truth which I have endeavoured to enforce, is in no instance more clearly exhibited than in the 25th chapter of St. Matthew, where our Lord is represented, on the solemn day of judgment upon the nations, as rewarding every kindness, or resenting every want of kindness to his members, as shown immediately to himself. "Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Nay, may we not add, that in proportion as the

sufferer is utterly destitute of every human help, the act passes beyond the immediate object, and terminates on Christ himself? In such a constitution of things, the children for whom I now plead may be of good courage. For they can claim an undisputed preeminence above all other human beings in weakness, helplessness, and destitution. Female orphans are to the mass of society what the apple of the eye is to the individual body. They are, without comparison, the tenderest and the most vulnerable portion of mankind. The causes which operate in rendering them so, have a deep foundation in the constitution of our nature. I do, in a word, believe, that the whole system of things around us was originally intended to assimilate man to God. And amongst other means conducive to this great purpose, I believe that all the various ties of kindred are but so many contrivances to call out and keep in motion those holy and divine, pure and amiable affections of the soul in which the image of God consists. The marriage bond, when that bond is sanctified, is represented in Scripture as a mysterious emblem of the union of a soul to Christ. And so also is the connexion of parent and child appealed to as the type of our relation to God. Children, then, are formed and fitted to call forth and to receive from those who gave them birth, that tenderness and that support which constitutes the parent a representative of God. But as Providence intends that male children should be earlier separated from the bosom of domestic life, and that our sons should grow up unsheltered as the young plants, they are not fitted as female children are to attract and to receive the full tide of parental influence and affection. These latter are enabled, by every circumstance peculiar to their sex, to centre, as it were, upon themselves the anxieties and interests of both their parents. And being thus formed as the recipients of all this tenderness, it follows that the loss even of one parent is to them a deprivation beyond all possibility of description. They stand in need equally of a father's protection and a mother's care: and no one who has not witnessed instances of the kind can conceive what the bereavement either of the one or of the other implies. Visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and you will see, especially amongst the poor, what a family has suffered when the only man, their head and their right arm at once, has been taken from them at a stroke. In this helpless state, it is most affecting to see how female children will sometimes cast themselves on the merest stranger, as if they caught some indication in his compassionate looks, that God had sent them a friend in their time of need, and raised up a father to the fatherless. Yes, their very manner will sometimes seem as if a father's fondness had taught them to expect the same endearments which drew forth all his tenderness to act with equal power upon the hearts of others. But alas! they too soon discover that though they may have kind and generous benefactors, they have not, to use the language of St. Paul, many fathers. Or go to that desolate abode where female children have lost a tender and a Christian mother. It is

true, such little ones may still have left to them a good and an indulgent father. He may defend from the oppressor's wrong, and guard his house of mourning from outward violence. But who shall minister to its thousand nameless wants within? Who shall answer the daily, hourly calls for those gentler services which nothing but a mother's eye, a mother's hand, and a mother's heart can yield?

But much may be done, and much is spared where one parent has been left. And it is both interesting and touching at times to see how the survivor can, like a single eye or single hand, perform the double office. I allude to the manner in which a widower will sometimes clothe himself in all a woman's tenderness, and strive, by the discharge of duties foreign from his sex, to make up to his children for their heavy loss, and to fill the chasm which death has made between himself and them. In like manner, I have myself been witness to the triumph of Christian principle and maternal tenderness, over all that could revolt a woman's feelings, or do violence to a widow's sacred sorrow. I have seen, as the prophet speaks, the tender and delicate woman, which, in appearance, would not adventure to put the sole of her foot upon the ground—I have seen such an one address herself to all the bustle of active business, and buffet the waves of this troublesome world, and arm herself to the unequal contest with those men who devour widows' houses, and pervert the judgment of the fatherless. Yes; I have seen such an one endued, as it were, with power from on high, and in a strength not her own, executing the trusts committed to her by her beloved husband, asserting the rights, and vindicating the wrongs, of her fatherless children.

But the destitutes for whom I plead have no parent! They are cut off both from root and stock. They have no natural protector from a hard, unfeeling world. It is no one's natural care to bring these young children to Christ, that he may bless them—it is no one's peculiar and delightful task to train their infant minds in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. There is no eye to check them by its anxious, tender look, if they go wrong, or to kindle into joy if they do well. Alas! those eyes are closed. Those lips from which they heard a parent's benediction and a parent's prayer, are sealed for ever. Thus uncheered, uncherished, and forlorn, is the female orphan who is cast, in childhood and poverty, upon the world. Such the utter destitution which these little ones would have experienced, were it not that they have been sheltered from the storm; they have found a hiding place; they have been taught almost to forget that they are orphans, in that blessed institution for which I plead. Grief does not fix its stamp or draw its furrows deeply on the minds of children. Kind treatment and cheerful occupation soon dry up their tears. And I am convinced that, taking this world of trial as it is, amongst the inmates of the Female Orphan House are to be found some of the happiest creatures on the face of the earth.

But upon the well-known merits of this institution I shall not dwell. The point to be ascertained to-day is, how long these children are to continue in it. Upon this day's collection depends, in a great degree, the existence of this establishment, at least on its present scale. Why this should be so, I can state to you in a few words. Formerly the conductors of the Orphan Charity annually sent in to government an estimate of their probable expenses for the ensuing year, together with a statement of the funds which they could probably command to meet it; and after an examination of the accounts in the proper office, a grant was made to the amount of the balance, however that balance might exceed one half of the whole expenditure. This year, however, matters are put upon a different footing; and all that can be expected from Parliament is a sum equal to what the institution shall derive from its other resources, chiefly from the application now made to you. The result of the change is, that unless the subscription this day far exceeds those of former years, the friends of the establishment tremble for its existence.

Allow me, then, I entreat you, to call your attention to the following consideration. If the collection this day is to exceed those of former years, this can be effected only by individual exertion; and if each of you be restrained by the fear of contributing beyond what you may conceive to be your proportion of the general amount, our hopes must fall to the ground. You may feel, perhaps, that if you knew the sum to be made up, you would give at once what was fairly your part; but you dread the thought of increasing your own individual subscription, when others may hold back, and thus leave you unfairly and disproportionately burdened. May I then entreat you to consider that if this principle be generally acted on, the whole must be a failure. May I earnestly beseech you to dismiss every thought of what others may do, and to rise individually at the orphans' cry, and to give plenteously as God has enabled you. If you give double your former offerings, what is a little compared with the sweet reflection that you may have been the means of rescuing one of these little ones from perishing?

If there is a failure this day, what effect can follow, but that some at least of these helpless beings must be turned out upon the world? Will you then avert from them a calamity which they are so utterly unable to bear? Alas! upon whom is the task to devolve of announcing to these twice-orphaned children that they must seek some other shelter? And who is to answer their artless inquiry, what they are to do, and whither they are to go? When this little band are cast out upon the streets of this great city, to what point shall they direct their trembling steps? Shall they turn back instinctively to the humble abodes where once a father and a mother cheered and blessed them, and strive to gain admission there? Or, when spurned by strangers from those doors, shall they, like Mary, go to their parents' graves, to weep there? Or shall they cast themselves on those who will

harbour them until they are ripe for ruin, and whose mercies to the female orphan will be bestowed upon no other terms than the surrender, in due time, of her innocence, her honour, and her hopes of heaven? No; young as they are, they have learned lessons which I trust can never be effaced. They never, in any extremity, would forget the guide of their youth, or forsake the covenant of their God. Though abandoned by every earthly friend, they would cast themselves upon the Father of the fatherless, even God in his holy habitation. Though darkness closed their prospects on every side, their prayers would pierce the clouds. They have the promise of that God who would not leave them nor forsake them; but would, in the lowest deep, with the temptation, make a way to escape, that they might be able to bear it.

But why should I anticipate trials which I am confident will never come? You will not drive these little ones to such hard extremities. You will not turn their cheerful hymns of praise into cries of destitution—into lamentations which will rise and testify against you to heaven. No; you will continue to shelter and to cherish these helpless children. And their prayers will ascend as a memorial before God. Yes, ceaseless prayers, that amidst all your trials and sorrows (for from trials and sorrows none are exempt below) that God will compassionate you, even as you had pity upon them.

ON THE DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

DEAR SIR,—I have been long desirous to see in your pages some strictures on the duties and responsibilities of members of committees, from an abler and more experienced pen than mine; however, as no one has yet taken up the subject, I beg to offer you a few observations on it.

It cannot but be felt as a slur on the benevolence, the philanthropy, and the zeal for God, of the Dublin Christians, that there are so few who will devote their attention to the management of the societies that are formed for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ, and for the spiritual or temporal welfare of their fellow-creatures; while among the people of the world abundance of persons may be found to conduct the affairs of a race-course or a ball. I believe it is a fact that there are some, whose names are on the committees of some of the societies, who never think of attending a committee meeting. There is a certain board, with six or eight members, the business of which is entirely conducted by two individuals; the rest never attend. There is another society,

which is near falling to the ground, not because its exertions are no longer needed, but because the conductors of it seldom or never meet in sufficient numbers to be able to act. I cannot be supposed to be acquainted with the internal arrangements of all; but from what I have heard, and as far as I know, I am afraid I must add, "*ex duobus discite omnes.*" I beg leave respectfully to say to such inefficient committee-men, "You are guilty of an actual breach of faith to the public. You have been entrusted with the care of funds, laboriously collected for charitable purposes; you have become stewards of the Lord's treasury, and it is required of stewards that a man be found faithful. No man can blame those who do not undertake what they either cannot or will not perform; but you are justly accountable both to God and man for the performance of what you do undertake. The *Christian Journal* for May last, contains a report of the speech of Dr. Cooke, at the last Continental Meeting at the Rotunda, which enforces more strongly than I can do your responsibilities; allow me to commend it to your consideration."

I would now make two suggestions to all the societies: First, that it should be for the future required of the assistant secretaries or whoever has the receipt of their funds, to give such security as may be thought fit. Of the necessity of this, the serious loss lately experienced by the Hibernian Auxiliary to the Jews Society affords a painful proof. Secondly, that every member of their committees, previous to his entering on office, should sign a declaration to the following effect:

"We, the undersigned having been entrusted with the care and control of the ——— Society, for the ensuing year, do hereby promise that we will give our best exertions to the furtherance of it; and that we will punctually attend on the days appointed for the committee meetings, unless prevented by some great and unexpected hindrance."

I remain, dear Sir, faithfully your's,

J. W. D.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN GERMANY.

It is now proposed to follow the German student's course, until he is established in his calling. At the close of his university career, two courses are open to his choice: either to take the regular degrees of doctor in philosophy and licentiate in theology, at the university, and become professor; or, by passing a regulated course of examinations, directly to enter the church. Of these the first is a step of more pretension and difficulty, and is effected by an examination of a higher and more scientific character, which is held by the university; the other by an examination held by a commission, or consistory, under the authority of government, for those who are simply candidates for the pastoral office. In both courses, so far as theology is concerned, the ground is nearly the same. The licentiate who is qualified to teach in the universities, if he should so desire, is also qualified to assume the pastoral office. This is, however, seldom his object.

The right of preaching conferred by university degrees, is purely discretionary. Among the German professors of theology, some are regular pastors, while others are not even regarded as belonging to the pastoral office. These are mostly the professors who undertake the branches of theology which have no immediate bearing on practical application.

We return to the other and larger class of theological students, who take the more common course of entering upon the pastoral functions, not through the universities, but in the ordinary way prescribed by the government. This consists in an *examen pro candidatura*, or *pro licentia concionandi*, which may take place before the consistory, or before a commission appointed for that purpose in the universities; and an *examen pro ministerio*, after the interval of a year, which is held only by the consistory.

In regard to the first examination, the introductory proceedings are similar in their nature and object to those required in an examination before the faculty of philosophy, as detailed above. To each individual who applies for examination a theme or subject is assigned, on which he is expected to write a dissertation, which must be handed over to the examiners within the period of six weeks. After this, other subjects are assigned, on which the candidate must write upon the spot, and under lock and key, as in the examinations of the gymnasia. At the same time he must hold a *catechisation*, and also deliver a sermon upon an appointed text. Then follows the oral examination, in which six of the candidates are ordinarily taken up at once. This covers, of course, all the ground of the several *Brodcollegia* heretofore described; and includes a particular examination on the exegesis of the Old and New Testaments; on systematical and symbolical theology, and ethics; on ecclesiastical and doctrinal history; and

also on philosophy and theological literature. The more particular examination on the practical department, is commonly reserved for the trial before the consistory.

They who pass these examinations receive the *licentiam concionandi*; and are called *Candidates of Theology*; but are not yet qualified to become pastors of churches.

That this is not a mere examination *pro forma*, is at once attested by the characters of the examiners, who are men of profound learning, either professors in the universities, or the most learned and distinguished of the clergy. And this is the turning point of the young theologian's life. To this time he has been looking forward in all his previous toilsome studies; because if he fails here, he loses the fruit of all his anxious labours. If he cannot honorably sustain this examination; if, above all, he be once turned by and fail upon a second trial, his bread for life is taken away, his name as a scholar is dishonored, and there is no part or portion of his country whither he can retire and there regain his standing. Every avenue to his profession is for ever closed up to him; and he must either starve, or consent to get his bread in some other humbler calling, with a mark of disparagement stamped for ever on his brow. In these facts we see the secret of that almost universal and unremitted diligence, which forms so distinguishing a characteristic of the students of the German universities.

But in these examinations, rigorous and decisive as they are, there is one omission which strikes our feelings with surprise and grief. By this door enter all the pastors and teachers of the church; of that church, the object of which is to keep alive the pure and holy flame of the Christian religion, and to extend the boundaries of God's kingdom upon earth. But to those thus entering, the question is never put, whether they have any regard for this kingdom of God; whether they have ever possessed the pure and holy flame of religious feeling; whether they are in any degree prompted to undertake this holy calling, from love to God or Christ, or to the souls of their fellow-men! The church, alas! is no longer at her own disposal, and cannot prove 'the spirits of her prophets whether they be of God.' She is but the slave of civil power; and all that she is at liberty to ask or know is, whether her prophets are regularly appointed by the king and his ministers. Not one question is ever asked as to their belief in a revelation, nor as to their personal motives in thus undertaking to be the ambassadors of God to man. When the shepherds are thus chosen without any reference to their fidelity, are we to wonder that the flock should go astray and become widely scattered?

The second examination essential as a qualification for the pastoral office, usually takes place before the consistory at the end of a year from the former. This interval may be variously employed by the student; he may preach, but not be chosen pastor. In most instances it is employed in study either at home, at the uni-

versity, or very rarely at the theological seminary at Wittenberg. Sometimes they act as teachers in the gymnasia or in families. Most, however, prefer to study for the second examination, in which a further progress is expected.

This the student may defer at his own discretion, but cannot hasten before the regulated year qualifies him for the office of pastor. There are different ways in which he may be appointed. In some few instances (in Westphalia particularly) the churches have the right of selection; in others, the lord of the village. In both these cases the sanction of the government, acting through the consistory, must confirm the nomination. In the majority of instances, the gift of livings is in the government, and is bestowed like any other office of state through the medium of the consistories, each of which has the charge of a separate department.

Should the candidate, after this examination, either from choice or necessity, not obtain the office of pastor for another year, he must sustain a third examination before he can be admitted to the office. In this case the form is, for the consistory to invite the candidate to a *colloquium*, and then examine him more or less closely as more or less time has elapsed since the former trial. The use of this excellent regulation is obvious. Having passed through all these previous qualifications, and obtained an appointment, the candidate receives ordination by the authority and direction of the consistory, and is inducted into his living.

We have thus endeavoured to follow throughout the course of preparation required of the German clergy and theologians, before they can arrive at a standing in the church or a university. These regulations are the results of a system by which the church is joined with, and made subservient to the state—in which it constitutes a subordinate department. We now turn to some general reflections, illustrative of the effects of such a system, both upon the clergy and the people.

This dependence of the church upon a power so arbitrary and despotic in its mode of regulation and interference, pregnant as it is with innumerable evils, has one solitary advantage, viz. that supported by the state, the church can enforce and render uniform its own recommendations in regard to church polity and religious instruction. It is in this way, no doubt, that the system has been introduced into every German school below the universities, of giving regular instruction on religious subjects. The character of this instruction must necessarily depend in a great measure on the teacher; but here, alas! the dominion of the church ceases, and the instructor is appointed without reference to his qualifications as a religious teacher. The consequence is, that the teaching is very often superficial, and not unfrequently is any thing but religious. In one instance related to the writer, it consisted wholly in illustrating the elements of botany by the exhibition and analysis of flowers, with an occasional reference to the goodness of the Deity in thus adorning the earth. But still;

in a course of years, the children acquire in this way at least some knowledge of facts; a foundation is laid, narrow and shallow indeed, in which in future years and under more auspicious circumstances, the Spirit may rear a nobler superstructure. A knowledge of the truth is assuredly the first step in leading men to embrace the truth; and in this point of view, the religious instruction given in the schools of Germany, defective as it is, and often unspiritual, is nevertheless of inestimable importance in the great system of means and instruments, in connexion with which the Spirit of God usually carries on its operations.

It is not to be denied that the system of instruction preparatory to confirmation, must, in the hands of a faithful pastor, afford one of the most powerful means that can be devised of operating upon the youthful mind, and forming it to habits and principles of religion. Previous to this ceremony, often for two years, but mostly for one, the pastor instructs the children. By a general rule he meets them twice a week; but during the four weeks before Easter, in which the ceremony takes place, he usually gives four lessons in the week. This instruction comprises, the history of the Christian religion; the general historical facts of the Bible, which are usually taught in a biblical catechism; the learning by heart of psalms and hymns; and towards the close, the confession of faith which they are to make in public on the day of confirmation. This is a regular duty of the pastoral office, and one which cannot be neglected. Indeed, the pastors generally regard it as one of the most pleasing and interesting of all their official duties, and engage in it with complacency at least, if not with zeal. The youthful mind is at this period in its most susceptible state, and most open to conviction, and to the influence of the thrilling motives and tender remonstrances, which a good shepherd knows how to urge in behalf of him who was 'meek and lowly of heart.' He meets his youthful flock frequently, and has the opportunity, if he does his duty, of becoming thoroughly acquainted with their different characters and dispositions; so that it is his fault alone, if he be not able to apply to each the instructions and exhortations which the nature of the case requires.

That the whole system has not been more efficacious in preserving an evangelical spirit in the community, must appear at first sight attributable to the unfaithfulness of the pastors. A little further consideration must, however, lead us to regard this itself as an effect which must be viewed as the natural working of the system of instruction at the university. In these, religious education is at an end. In none of the German universities are there any devotional exercises; and the attendance on public worship is in very few cases required. An exclusive regard to the science of theology, is the uniformly pervading spirit of the whole of the university system; and must, as a direct consequence, have led to that rationalism, which thus beginning with the pastors, is now, we fear, firmly fixed among the people.

It is the natural result of this state of things that theological students, having, for the most part, adopted the study of this profession, without any reference to the high and holy motives which ought to govern all who assume it, and regarding it in no more sacred point of view than if they were pursuing the study of law, or medicine, or philology, what reason have they to put on an appearance of seriousness to which their hearts are strangers? or to abstain from practices which they have never felt, and do not now feel, to be incompatible with their future standing, any more than they are incompatible with the standing of a lawyer or a physician? The consequence is, that all the vices for which German students have been famous, are no less common among the theologians than among others; and they are as likely as any to be found engaged in gambling, drunkenness, broils, duels, and every species of *renowning*. In looking abroad upon the German churches, and reflecting upon their prospects and destiny, it is melancholy to think that such must, for a time at least, be the character of the great majority of their future pastors and teachers. Among the nine hundred students of theology at Halle, not more than from one hundred to one hundred and fifty can be reckoned as possessing seriousness of character in any degree, or as having chosen this profession from any other than the most worldly motives; and of this comparatively small number, not more than one-half can be regarded as possessing personal religion, or as actuated in choosing their course by motives of religious duty. And it would be difficult to say, that the proportion of truly pious students among the theologians, small as it is here represented, is much greater at any other university; unless, perhaps, from peculiar circumstances, at Berlin.

The only species of strictly religious instruction which students receive at the university, is, as has been said, the public services of Sundays and of such other days as are celebrated by the church (all of which usually have no connexion with the university); and further, such private instruction and exhortation as pious professors (if there be such) choose to impart in their more familiar intercourse with their pupils. In Berlin, the houses of several of the professors are open one evening every week, for the purposes of *conversation*, which may be religious or otherwise. At these little meetings the time is variously occupied, according to the individuals who are present; sometimes it is religious conversation, assuming now a scientific form, and again a practical tendency; sometimes a chapter of the Bible is read and expounded, followed by a personal application of the subject to the consciences of the hearers; at another time, some other book is read, and the conversation turns upon any subject thus started. The pious students have also sometimes similar meetings among themselves; but such assemblies, when no professor is present, are looked upon with a jealous eye by the government; and they

are therefore not recommended by those who wish well to the cause of religion.

All such assemblies would be deemed imperfect without singing; in which the Germans delight, and all take part. Indeed, taken as a nation, the Germans may be said to be more fond of music than even the Italians; and it is notoriously the fact, that both vocal and instrumental music, and especially the latter, is more generally cultivated there than among their more southern neighbours. In sacred music they take the lead of all other nations; and in all their seasons of worship, this holds almost an equal place with prayer; or, indeed, it is in itself prayer, the pouring out of the soul to God in strains of harmony, as well as tears of contrition. An organ is an essential part of the furniture of a church, as much so, perhaps, in popular opinion and feeling, as the sacramental vessels of the altar. In the ordinary singing of the psalms, the congregation all join; the music being wholly of the slow choral species, which admits all to take a part, without the need of great skill or practice. In other portions of the service there is often music from a choir. Some of these choirs are very celebrated.

Among the pernicious consequences of this exclusive cultivation of theology as a science, must be numbered the rapid accumulation of new opinions and new authorities—an effect not merely evil in itself, but coupled with the additional evil of causing a neglect of the old. Thus it is a consequence that, with few exceptions, there are no standard authors, such as Butler, or Baxter, or Doddridge. When a man dies, his works are forgotten. Michaelis is there no longer regarded as a profound scholar; Eichorn is reckoned superficial; a Schleusner has outlived both his influence and fame.

This evil is partly caused by the system of oral instruction at the universities, by which the pupils are made to depend in a very great degree upon the *dicta* of the teacher before them. This confidence in his oral instruction they transfer also to his writings; and the consequence is, a paramount acquaintance with, and attachment to, the works of living authors, whose lectures they have themselves attended, or whom they have learned to admire and repose confidence in, from the reports of friends or the voice of public fame. It is taken for granted that there is a constant progress in every science; and that a learned man of the present day stands on higher ground than one of former days, possessing as he does all the results of the labours and investigations of those who have preceded him, as well as those which his own industry and sagacity may have enabled him to supply. His works are therefore supposed to be, *prima facie*, superior to former works on the same subjects; and hence there arises throughout the German theological world the spirit of the Athenians, the desire in this respect to become acquainted with τὸ καινότερον. The writer once, in conversation with a German

professor, one of the most distinguished for piety and learning; spoke of Hug's Introduction to the New Testament as being probably the best extant. He assented to the remark as true at that time; but observed that the introduction of De Wette (which was not then published) would probably be better, because it would be *newer*. The result, however, according to his own subsequent acknowledgment, did not in this instance correspond to his expectation.

From these considerations it becomes obvious that we may naturally look to Germany for a learned and also an able clergy; but it affords equally a sufficient data to account for that non-intercourse which subsists between the pastor and his people. The pastor feels that he has done his duty, (and public opinion and universal practice sanction this belief,) when he has gone through the public services of Sunday, and the catechising of the children, and has attended the funerals, baptisms, and weddings, that occur.

It is in this way that the pastors find time to apply themselves to study. Some become editors of classic authors; others write books on theology; some cultivate botany or mineralogy; and others again become farmers. It is in this way also that distinguished professors in the universities can at the same time be pastors of churches. They have time for all these things; because they do not 'give themselves wholly to their ministry.' This is a general feature of the German church; and individuals, therefore, are not to be made objects of particular censure; but we may lament the circumstances which have brought about this state of things, and have reason to offer earnest prayers to God, that light may shine upon their way and guide them in the path of duty.

As there is little intercourse between the pastors and their people, so also the clergy have little professional intercourse among themselves. Associations of ministers for the purposes of friendly intercourse or mutual improvement, or to devise means for promoting the great objects to which their lives are professedly devoted, are almost unknown. Within a few years, a meeting of this kind has been set on foot by the evangelical clergy within a wide circle around Halle, which has sometimes been attended by twenty persons or more, some of whom have travelled fifty miles in order to be present. Whether it will prove permanent, remains to be seen. But this was the only thing of the kind which the writer heard of in Germany, although he made much inquiry on the subject. There may not, improbably, however, be other similar meetings established in other parts of the country among the evangelical clergy; certainly not among the rationalists; but it is obviously so rare an occurrence, that a knowledge of it is not generally diffused.

The character of German preaching is such as would naturally arise out of the circumstances and character of the clergy. Among the great body it is of course merely moral preaching, in

which the *Gospel* occupies a very inferior part. But even among the evangelical clergy, the preaching is rather of the general, hortatory, declamatory kind; not direct and pointed, nor calculated to arouse sinners, and make them feel their dangers and wants, and the necessity of flying to a Saviour's cross. In all this, however, it only resembles much of the English preaching of the present day.

After these remarks on the general character and personal inactivity of the clergy, it cannot be anticipated that the church itself, as a body, would exhibit any great degree of energy and activity. There is, indeed, no lack of preachers either in town or country; it is the want of spiritual-minded and devoted pastors that is felt throughout all the churches, and throughout the land. On the great body of the clergy, whatever might be their own personal feelings and wishes, the state of things here described must present obstacles which few, however zealous, have energy, properly tempered with discretion, to surmount. But what must be expected when the greater part of them have entered upon their sacred office without feeling any interests in its holy duties, and without even the pretence of possessing love to God, or any special regard to the eternal welfare of the souls of their fellow-men? when they deny the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and instead of making them "the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice," degrade them, practically at least, to a level with the Koran and the Zend-Avesta? The result is precisely what might have been apprehended. Preachers of this class have first poisoned the minds of their hearers; and then the latter, following out the spirit of the precepts and (often) the example of their teachers, have left them to preach to empty walls. There are, however, some exception. Many of the churches in Berlin are always well filled. When Strauss or Schleirmacher preach, they are sure to draw a crowded audience; as is also the case with most of the evangelical preachers. In one small church, where the gospel is literally 'preached to the poor,' there is always such a throng, that it is almost impossible to obtain admission. At other times the churches of Berlin are not more filled than others. At Wittemberg, under the ministrations of Heubner, and other pious pastors, the principal church is filled to overflowing. The other church, on whose door Luther posted up his celebrated theses, and in which he and Melancthon lie buried, has been assigned to the use of the theological seminary; and the students preach there to empty pews.

The same neglect of public worship in general, which keeps so many wholly away from the church, induces most of those who profess to attend, to limit their presence to the time occupied by the sermon. It is the common practice to arrive just before the preacher commences, and to leave immediately or soon after he has closed.

Whether or not this general disregard of the institutions of public worship, especially upon the Sabbath, is in any important

degree to be referred to the light in which the Sabbath is regarded by the whole German church, is a question worthy of deep and serious consideration. It is well known, and needs not to be repeated here, that the views of the Protestant churches generally on the Continent, in regard to the first day of the week, coincide in the main points with those of the Roman Catholic church. They suppose the Jewish Sabbath to have been abrogated under the New Testament dispensation; and that the first day of the week, instead of coming into the place of the Jewish Sabbath, is to be kept simply as a religious festival in commemoration of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, and is recommended, only as such, by the practice of the Apostles and Christians of the earliest ages.

Now, in this state of things, we might reasonably draw the conclusion—and it is difficult to see why it would not be a correct one—that to persons holding this view of the Sabbath, the stated exercises of that day would become an object of less interest and of less importance, and would naturally in a course of years come to be entirely disregarded and neglected. So far as we can see, this must be the inevitable tendency and consequence of such a belief; and the present state of the German churches might properly be adduced as an illustration of the effects of considering the Sunday as no Sabbath—as no more than a church holiday.

Where public worship is thus disregarded we cannot expect the private worship of families to be widely practised. Practical piety, though it is not the necessary consequence of an attendance upon public services, cannot generally subsist without it. An instructor in one of the leading German universities, himself a pious man, and the son of a pastor, had never even heard of family prayers (except as a historical fact) till he had visited England.

Of course, meetings for social prayer are almost unknown. A few families in Berlin, and some of them of rank, have a private circle in their houses every week, for the purposes of religious conversation and social worship. To these circles however, none are admitted but invited guests. In Halle there was regularly a religious meeting every Saturday evening, at the house of a mechanic, where students sometimes attended. This meeting was ever a subject of ridicule among the greater part of the citizens, and of jealousy to the magistracy; and several attempts were made to bring home upon it charges of disorder and irregularity, in order to have a pretext for putting it down. These attempts, however, failed; and every investigation only resulted in showing, not only that the meeting was the occasion of no disorders, but that it was quietly and regularly conducted, and had for its sole object to make those who attended better men and better citizens.—Under circumstances like the above, it hardly needs to be added here, that the monthly concert of prayer for missionary objects is attended only in a

few of the cities; where it is sometimes treated with great reproach and contempt.

It is but just to admit, that so far as the Gospel is received faithfully, there is no nation in which its spirit is more fully exemplified than in Germany. The frankness, open-heartedness and simplicity, the overflowing of the spirit of Christian brotherhood; and the freedom from censorious spirit, which characterize the German Christian, make it more to be lamented that such is not the general character of the church and people.

Where such is the general state of religion, it scarcely remains to be observed, "that our German brethren in Christ have not yet learned the grand secret of producing great public effects. They do not act in concert. They have not yet learned that *united* action is *powerful* action. There are, indeed, Bible societies, and missionary societies, and tract societies, some of which have long existed, and have individually done much good. The Bible institute of Canstein, and the missionary society of the orphan-house in Halle, have been in being since the days of Francke. But the effects produced by all these, have been the result rather of individual effort, either of some single director or particular missionaries. Combined effort there has been none; nor have the public at large, or even the great body of orthodox Christians, interested themselves at all in the subject, or even been made acquainted with the facts. They would seem almost to have gone upon the principle of not letting 'the left hand know what the right hand doeth;' one society having known little or nothing of the proceedings of the others. Nor in the present time of awakening excitement, has there been hitherto any great improvement in this respect. Societies have been established, and have become individually more active; but they have as yet no united plan of action. The missionary society of Berlin, for instance, which one would suppose might naturally extend its branches, at least throughout the north of Germany, has no branches. So also of Leipsic and other cities. The nearest approach to union is in the south of Germany, where the missionary seminary of Basle forms a *nucleus*, around which cluster the affections and the exertions of Christians in the neighbouring states of Baden and Württemberg. Here is published a quarterly Missionary Journal, and weekly Missionary Reports, which obtain a wide circulation, and excite a deep interest in the missionary cause.

In reviewing the combination of circumstances which have been offered in these statements, an important reflection forces itself upon our notice. Whatever may be allowed for the national temperament of Germany, 'its intellectual activity and want of practical energy;' it is apparent that we have, in the German churches, an exhibition of the various consequences which may be naturally expected from the existence of such a system of political and legislative control over the church. We see the church armed with the power, which in this coun-

try she can never possess, of authoritatively regulating the qualifications of her pastors; and furnished with all the apparatus of schools and universities, and able and learned teachers, to carry her requisitions into complete effect. We see the civil power lending its aid to enforce all these requisitions; to erect and repair churches; to augment the income of the clergy; to recommend attendance on public worship, and the practice of virtue and religious duty. What more, it may be asked, can a church need, in order to go on and prosper, and grow every day in strength, and influence, and usefulness? Alas! these things are but the frame-work, the naked skeleton, strung together with wires, which an external hand moves and regulates at will. Unless the flesh and blood, the warm vigour of life, the all-pervading and directing soul be there, then is all power and authority, all talent and learning however profound, of no avail whatever. In Germany the governments give to the church all the aid which human power can afford; but still they are but the external hand that manages the wires.*

To reduce religion to a theological science, and to cultivate that science in disregard of all that is vital in religion, is not merely the vice of a nation, but the inborn temper of mankind. In all things it is the observable tendency of men, and bodies of men, to forget the end, in the systematic pursuit of the means: but most of all it is so with regard to that system of which the estimate is not ungrateful to the ambitious intellect, the controversial zeal, and the factious animosity of men; while the end is directly at variance with them all. It is thus that that singular contradiction in the best of things in so many ways exist; churches without a worship; theology without regard to the service of God; systems of Christian doctrine without scriptural authority. It is thus that the plain and simply uttered revelations of the Spirit are so often attempted to be set aside, or explained into something within the narrow range of human

* The American Professor, whose articles in *The Andover Biblical Repository* we have, in this and our former numbers, contracted, here indulges in observations on the evil consequences of civil governments enforcing creeds and regulating religious belief. In those opinions we, of course, cannot coincide; for, while we allow that bad results must ensue, as they have, from the arbitrary interference of the despotic German governments in the promotion, the teaching, and the preaching of the clergy, still, when we look to the experience of three centuries, as afforded us in the history of the churches of England and Scotland, we cannot but see that the national establishment of a religious creed, as to be professed and taught by the PASTORS of the church, and which, while regulating public religion, does not attempt to interfere with private religious belief, is a system which, while it gives permanence to doctrine, does not exclude pious practices and the holiest feelings. And we think the established churches of the British Isles can stand a comparison with voluntary churches all over the world, for the evangelical purity of belief and spiritual devotion, and devotedness of both pastors and people.—ED.

intelligence; or lowered into the defective moralities of worldly observance. Hence the rationalizing spirit—of all the most irrational—exerts its superficial dogmas, and wields its circumscribed logic to prove all to be untruth that cannot be invented without the help of revelation, and observed without the grace of the Spirit. Such is, and has ever been the religion of the human mind, as opposed to the spirit-humbling and heart-subduing truths of God. It is the distinguishing character of such to prosper by human policy, for the simple reason that it is their appropriate instrument—acute and cunning, but shallow: abounding with knowledge, though ignorant of the truth: the children of this world, ‘wiser in their generations than the children of light,’ are successful in the prosecution of their objects, while the simpler and more single-minded followers of Christ have neither the power, the cunning, the systematic worldliness, the combination, or perhaps the will to engage in the combat of faction with the powers that overrule, or the earthly wisdom that circumvents them on every side. But in opposition to this they have trust; they know the firm-built house in which they stand; they know the invisible arm which upholds, and the overruling foresight and power which has appointed the times and seasons for all things.

While we would gladly witness in our German brethren in Christ, something of that union of purpose and concert of action, from which alone, so far as regards human means, any general effect can be produced; yet we hold out to them the hand of brotherhood, and call to them in the voice of courage and confident hope: we bid them go on, and pray that they may prosper in their faithful walk, not fearing the power of earth, but trusting in the sure protection of him whose wisdom does not slumber, and who has promised to be with his church to the end. They may not have the power to resist the unhallowed combination of an infidel philosophy and a dogmatizing theology, with a despotic state policy; it may be perilous to resist the earthly authority that substitutes the dogmas of a university, and the decrees of a council, for the spiritual and saving truth in Christ. But we call to them to remember that to them, amongst the unscriptural world, is entrusted this precious deposit; that they are the chosen messengers of the living God; and however it may be a part of duty, and even policy, to submit, that submission has also a sacred limit. When the mandates of earthly rule become directly opposed to the higher jurisdiction of the King of kings and Lord of lords, the faithful Christian’s duty may then be best expressed in the Apostle’s words when placed in a similar difficulty, “Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye.”

[NOTE.—This is the continuation of a series of articles, which, by a mistake of the printer’s, was stated to be concluded in our Number for May.—EDITOR.]

ON THE CHERUBIM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—Having so far matured some thoughts on the Cherubim as to make them the subject of a sermon last Trinity Sunday, I wish, while they are fresh in my recollection, to request permission to record the substance of them in the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, because I believe them to be of importance for illustrating several passages of Holy Scripture, on which, I apprehend, a considerable degree of obscurity has hitherto rested. However, I disclaim at once the opinion that the cherubic emblems were instituted to symbolize the ever-blessed Trinity in unity, and the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. I conceive that for Christians to adopt this opinion, would be to incur the condemnation of the Psalmist, by “changing their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth grass;” besides that it is evident that worshippers are symbolized, and not the object of worship, by the ζῶα in the 4th and 5th chapters of the Apocalypse. My only reason for choosing this discussion on Trinity Sunday was because it is suggested by a portion of this wondrous Book appointed to be read on that day, and calculated to awaken in our hearts that sublime song, “Holy, holy, holy to the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit.”

The first question which I endeavoured to answer was this, What is signified by the four living creatures exhibited in the vision to St. John, with the four and twenty elders? And I have no hesitation in humbly maintaining that they signify “the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven.” For proof I refer to the new song which they, jointly with the elders, sung to the Lamb: “Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.” Those who offer the thanksgiving are *the redeemed*; but it is evidently offered by the Elders and the living creatures. These, therefore, do both together signify the company of the redeemed; the latter being the symbols of the general body, and the elders representing ministerial leaders in the heavenly choir, corresponding to the twenty-four Levitical singers in the First Book of Chronicles. I am aware that an attempt may be made to rend the passage by a grammatical observation upon gender. But I rely for the present* upon the

* I do not see a grammatical necessity (as the neuter term here signifies personally) for referring ἱερεῖς, in chapter v. verse 8, to the elders alone; but if any think that there is, the necessity certainly does not extend to ἀδελφοί. And if any agree with Griesbach in rejecting ἡμῶν from the text; still the praise is for redemption; and if the voices of the four-and-twenty

general impression and obvious meaning of the text; passing by also any notice of a various reading, in the hope that the harmonious result of the whole of what I have to submit to the consideration of your readers, will ultimately leave no doubt upon their minds. I am glad that I am in a great degree supported in the interpretation I have offered by that excellent commentator, Scott; although I think he inverts the application of the symbols. His argument that the greater number, *twenty-four*, must represent the whole church, and the four living creatures only a part, appears to me to be inconclusive. There is nothing to lead to a numerical comparison where the symbols are so different; and even admitting numerical comparison, must we not regard the number of the quadruple living creatures as indefinite, since they are described as "in the midst of the throne and round about the throne?" The fourfold emblem must have been multiplied; and I see no ground for the supposition, that the four appearances of the man, the lion, the ox, and the eagle, were divided in St. John's vision. I feel also constrained to differ from the same high authority, when he expounds the cherubim, in Ezekiel, as representative of angels; though he sees them in the Apocalypse surrounded by myriads of the angelic host. From the identity of the signs, I infer identity of signification, as there is nothing to prove diversity; and then there is an easy transition to the cherubim in the Holy of Holies. The emblems in the Revelation are identical with those in Ezekiel; therefore they are identical with the cherubim in the Holy of Holies. Therefore these last signify the heavenly company of the redeemed, as already has been proved of the first; and the only step which remains to be proved is, that the symbols in Ezekiel corresponded to those which stood on each side of the mercy-seat. Of this the proof is found in the 20th verse of the 10th chapter of Ezekiel: "This is the living creature that I saw under the God of Israel by the river of Chebar, and I knew that they were cherubims." How did the prophet know this? I perceive no other way that can be reasonably suggested than by their likeness to the two compound figures in the Holy of Holies.

A very interesting and important inquiry here occurs: to con-

only are to be heard in this new song, their very name indicates their representative character and office, and that they speak in the name of the whole assembly. Now, the *ζωα* do not symbolize the Trinity, nor do they symbolize angels; and we may venture to affirm, that the only remaining signification is that of the triumphant church of the redeemed. And whether they be silent or join their voices and their harps, it is impossible not to admit that they unite in the adoration, and that their gratitude for the blood of the Lamb is the life of the thanksgiving, whether they are afterwards presented in the first or in the third person. We arrive at the same conclusion by either course, and it derives confirmation from the etymology of the word cherubim, which, I believe, in the original, suggests the idea of likeness to a multitude.

sider how these cherubic emblems were suited to express the signification which I have attributed to them? In answer to this inquiry, I beg leave first to state, in the form of assertion, what I believe I have collected from the Holy Scriptures, and then to support my interpretation by scriptural quotations. I would in this way venture to affirm, that the cherubim were in the nature of hieroglyphic emblems, most significantly symbolizing the church above, redeemed from among men, and created anew in Christ Jesus.

From Ezekiel xli. 18, 19, we learn that the cherubim in the sanctuary of the temple consisted only of two faces, a man and a lion; but the visions, in the beginning of this prophet, prove that the perfect cherubim consisted of four faces. And what does this difference suggest? It suggests that two different states of man are signified. The first his fallen state, characterized by the face of a man united to that of a ferocious beast, yet brought under a dispensation of mercy in the sanctuary of God, in virtue of the promise made concerning the seed of the woman, and the bruising of the serpent's head. In due time, man, redeemed by the blood of Christ, is brought through the sanctuary within the veil, and into the holiest of all; that is, even into heaven itself. But, oh! how changed! It is true man appears there also connected with the lion, in part identifying the emblem with that of the sanctuary; but his companion is no longer a ferocious lion; it is a lion tamed, and with a new nature; for he is in union with the peaceful ox; according to the lovely images of the 11th chapter of Isaiah, where a spiritual renovation by the grace of God is exhibited in figurative, but easily intelligible language. "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them; and the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox; and the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Here we find the calf and the young lion in perfect harmony, and the disposition and habits of the lion altogether changed. Apply this illustration to the cherubic emblems, and the meaning of them cannot be mistaken, especially when we add the signification of the fourth face, which was that of an eagle. For we learn from the last verse of the 40th chapter of Isaiah, that this striking figure denotes the soaring of the affections to the throne of God. "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles."

It remains to apply the foregoing interpretation to the cherubim mentioned in the beginning of Genesis. We have seen that the cherubim in the Revelation are clearly distinguished from angels, and signify persons redeemed by the blood of the Lamb. We have identified them with the cherubim in Ezekiel, and in

the Holy of Holies. We have learned to translate the figurative import of this hieroglyphic language; why then should we experience any difficulty wherever the same language occurs? Let us dismiss the popular notion of a guard of angels, and all obscurity vanishes. The cherubim were not angels, but emblems of the redeemed from among mankind. If they had been heavenly sentinels, they would no doubt have been furnished with many swords, and not merely with one "flaming sword which turned every way." This was none other than the flame of fire which appeared to Moses in the bush; it also assumed the form of a pillar of fire in conducting the armies of Israel, and resting by night upon the tabernacle. It was the glorious **SHEKINAH** manifesting the presence of **JEHOVAH**; and therefore the inspired Psalmist prays, in the 80th Psalm—"Thou that dwellest between the cherubims, shine forth." We read of a corresponding appearance in the vision of Ezekiel i. 4-6: "And I looked, and, behold, a whirlwind came out of the north, a great cloud, and a fire infolding itself, and a brightness was about it, and out of the midst thereof, as the colour of amber, out of the midst of the fire. Also out of the midst thereof came the likeness of four living creatures; and this was their appearance, they had the likeness of a man; and every one had four faces, and every one had four wings."

Let us now conceive a tabernacle, somewhat similar, and similarly furnished, with that in the wilderness, placed on the east of the Garden of Eden. We know that sacrifices, typical of the offering of the body of Christ, were instituted by the Lord; for otherwise Abel could not have offered in faith of the firstlings of his flock. It evidently follows, that the design and meaning of these sacrifices were explained. Hence it is no fanciful supposition that the figurative interpretation of the cherubim was given to our first parents by their merciful God, who still vouchsafed to maintain communion with them. He who promised to them a victorious Saviour—He who condescended to make coats of skins and clothe them—He who taught them the way of reconciliation by sacrifice—would not omit to instruct them further in his purposes and in their duty. One very essential part of this instruction was conveyed and recorded by the cherubic figures, divinely ordained, and divinely expounded. And thus we may perceive how they were graciously instituted "to keep the way of the tree of life," not as a guard, to turn Adam and Eve and their posterity from the tree of life that was in the midst of the garden, but as a means of preserving the knowledge of God's revealed purposes of redeeming love, and of the way of embracing that love and inheriting immortality by faith.

Such a view of the nature and meaning of the Cherubim may, perhaps, enable us to sing part of the *Te Deum* in a more scriptural sense than we have hitherto been accustomed. "To thee Cherubim and Seraphim continually do cry, Holy, holy, holy!" that is, the united choir of the redeemed "from every kindred,

and tongue, and people," with "an innumerable company of angels." The seraphim are, indeed, angels; and we find, in the 6th chapter of Isaiah, their worship of the Lord of Hosts recorded; who is identified with Jesus of Nazareth in the 12th chapter of the Gospel by St. John. And in the vision presented to him in the Isle of Patmos, myriads both of the redeemed and of the angels, the cherubim and seraphim, were heard "saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven," &c. "and the four living creatures said, Amen." It is remarkable that they did not say amen to the preceding ascription of praise for redemption; because they had themselves joined in the expression of it; but to the anthem of the immense multitude by which they were surrounded, and to the universal echo of creation, they did respond. We may be sure they would have done the same before, if, without them, the four and twenty elders had sung, "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." I conclude with calling attention to this circumstance, as affording corroborative evidence that the interpretation I have endeavoured to establish of the cherubic symbols is true.

I am, Sir, yours,

W. N.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—I have been frequently struck with astonishment at the numerous methods tried for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the Irish peasantry, and I have with pain beheld the total failures most of them in their turn have experienced. It appears to me that the reason of this occurrence is simply this: experimentalists are mistaken in the *cause* of their misery, and endeavour to dry up, without radically curing, the distemper. The attempts, consequently, of such men, and the adoption of such measures, will always be futile—always unavailing. For instance, a new system of agriculture—new inventions in machinery are proposed, but without effect; for the minds of our fellow-countrymen are so embued with ancient prejudices, that they consider every departure from the plans they had adopted and were reared up in as a deviation from nature. Incredulous, they hate every improvement. This remark bears with peculiar force on the *aged* of the community, who, notwithstanding every advice, will cling with fondness even to the errors of their youth. The rising generation must be tried, and we shall have at least one hindrance removed from our way, that is prejudice. But it must be impossible to show them the faults of their parents, unless their eyes are opened by instruction; and, as knowledge is power, they will be armed with new force to commit violence, unless these accessions of strength be directed into proper channels, through which they may flow, fertilizing the soil through which they pass. If there be education at all (and I conceive it can be shown that it is much wanted), it must be, if efficient, if salutary, a moral and religious one. The cause of a soldier's being restrained by stricter law than an ordinary subject, is obvious—he is furnished with means of being dangerous to the state, unless his exertions be applied in defending his country or in punishing its enemies. 'Tis so with the people; being ignorant, they are comparatively harmless; educate them in their present dispositions, and you give them acquired and increased ability to carry into execution their mischievous designs. To restrain them by persuasion is out of the question; for—

“Totas effundis habenas
Curriculo; quem si revoces subsistere necit,
Et te contempto rapitur metisque relictis.”

In this case, the persons who instruct them are justly to be blamed for the calamities that follow; for he that soweth the seed is the cause of the evils that spring up. Thus, therefore, not only education is necessary, in a political point of view, for the purpose of preparing the minds of the people to receive more correct ideas on the tillage of the soil, and the improvement of

manufacture, but religious or moral instruction is also required to act as a check to this acquired power. To accomplish this, it is necessary to have religion and morality inculcated either on each and every day, or to select one day from the week for that purpose. When the former is practicable, it is certainly good; but I fear that the mind, being distracted with various studies, will not bend to that particular one with that consideration and abstracted attention which will enable it to comprehend with accuracy the subject before it; whereas, on the contrary, the whole man being occupied in the same pursuit, will inevitably attain its end—like rays of light concentrated in a focus, will illuminate the darkest object. There is, then, no day of the week so suitable for this purpose as the first, both on account of the reason last advanced, and because many persons, desirous of obtaining information, cannot, through poverty, attend to a daily school, although free; and can, with perfect convenience and advantage, go to a Sunday school. That day should be entirely occupied with the concerns of the soul, and the business conducted in such institutions is confined as much as possible to this point. Seeing, Mr. Editor, some of the advantages (for I do not think it proper to trespass on your patience by enumerating all of them) that arise from Sabbath schools, and their manifest tendency to improve the morals, correct the habits, and enlighten the understandings of our fellow-countrymen, I am surprised that such apathy exists in the higher orders of our brethren on this most important subject. Possibly some have not considered it with attention, and others think it a matter beneath the dignity of the landlord. To the Christian believer it might be proper to observe, that it is part of his duty to disseminate the seeds of life—to put his mouth to the gospel trumpet—to strain every nerve and exert every faculty in extending the Redeemer's kingdom; and I would ask him in what manner he, as a private Christian, as an enlightened gentleman, could more effectually attain these objects than by means of Sunday schools? If he has not hitherto viewed this question in this light, let him carefully consider it. But if he be already engaged in this interesting undertaking, I would say, "whatever is to be observed, let constancy be observed; and whatever is to be avoided, let indifference be avoided." Such work will be a blessing to his own soul; for the communication of truth, like mercy, is twice blessed—"it blesseth him that gives and him that takes." But to the men who, like Gallio, care for none of these things, I will endeavour to show that it is their personal interest to forward the cause of Sunday schools; because men who have been educated at Sunday schools are, for the most part, moral, if not religious characters, and therefore observe this rule, "Owe no man any thing;" acting on this principle, they will pay their creditors, not from fear of law or prison, but from a higher motive—from a conscientious feeling in the mind which will not permit them to violate any known law of God, or of man, when not opposed to the former. As a

confirmation of this, look for a moment at the comparative prosperity and quiet of Scotland and Ireland, and you will immediately perceive that the advantage of the former is to be attributed to the difference between the education of the people of the two countries. Or cross not the sea, but contrast Connaught with Ulster, and see the vast space between the happiness of the one and the misery of the other; observe, also, the ratio of rents you will find the north more highly set than the other, although the land is not better, or probably so good. Hence it is that the value of the soil is enhanced by the morality of its inhabitants, who are, at the same time, fervent in prayer and diligent in business. I, for one, Mr. Editor, never knew a *slothful* Christian, nor a religious man indifferent to his calling in life; for they well know that idleness is the root of all evil, and therefore train up their children in habits of industry and active usefulness. Departing from the estimate of agriculture, we pass on to other employments. We shall find the observation fully borne out by incontrovertible facts, that arts, commerce, and manufactures, are assisted and encreased by means of moral and religious education. The promotion of this object I conceive to be the highest degree of patriotism. This is pure, active, *unbought* benevolence. I will conclude by recommending to all to show their regard for the Word of Truth, the souls and bodies of their fellow-countrymen, and their own *self-interest*, to encourage, by all lawful means, the progress of Sunday schools in Ireland.

I am, dear Sir, your faithful Servant,

CÆNOBITES.

GREEK AND TURKISH ACCOUNTS OF THE CAPTURE OF CONSTANTINOPLE,

MAY 29TH, 1453.

(Continued from page 480.)

A very apocryphal story of the capture of a French princess, in some ships designed to relieve Constantinople, leads Evliya into a long digression respecting the fate of Jem-Shah, or Zim-Zim, as he is called by the Italian writers. This prince was poisoned by that monster of iniquity, Pope Alexander VI. to prevent the king of France from acquiring fresh political influence, by possessing the person of a claimant to the throne of Constantinople. According to Evliya, Jem Shah was the son of Mohammed, by the French princess whom he had intercepted: and after the death of "The Conqueror," he claimed the throne on the pretence that Bayezid II., his elder brother, not being of royal birth by the mother's side, had no right to royal inheritance. The importance of the historical question thus raised by our Turkish author is very great; for it is connected with the period when the crimes of the papacy received their consummation in the person of Alexander Borgia; and we shall therefore examine it briefly after we have concluded the history more immediately before us.

The fate of Constantinople was now manifestly inevitable; Constantine offered to accept any terms consistent with religion and royalty; but the Turk had taken his final resolution, that the city should contain his throne or his grave. Having consulted the astrologers, in whom he reposed great confidence, Mohammed fixed the 29th day of May for the final assault; and the announcement of his design filled the Turkish camp with enthusiastic delight. Ducas says,

"Towards evening, messengers were sent through all the camp, ordering a general illumination. When the lights were kindled, they raised impious shouts, repeating the symbol of their accursed creed. The lamps and torches were so numerous, that they gave a brighter light than that of the sun, illuminating the whole city, Galata, the harbour, the shipping, and even the vessels at anchor beyond Scutari; the surface of the sea shone like molten gold; and would to heaven! that the flames had been not simply shining, but also consuming the tyrant's fleet and camp. The Romans (Greeks) believing that the Turkish tents had taken fire, ran as far as the ruins of the wall to see the event; and, from the shouts and dances of the barbarians, easily conjectured the cause of the illumination."

The last night of his life and his empire was spent by Constantine in a manner that well became a monarch, a hero, and a Christian. He summoned round him the chief of his officers, and

addressed them in a speech equally remarkable for its powerful appeals to patriotic feelings, and for the pious submission to the divine will, which it every where manifests. A report of it is preserved by Phranza, who was present, and though he probably has altered the language, we hold that he has preserved the sentiments, though Gibbon sneers at it as too like a sermon. To us it appears exactly such a speech as would be delivered by one desirous to inspire others with hopes that he felt not himself, and anxious to discharge punctually his last temporal duties, before his passage into eternity. From the council-chamber Constantine passed to the assembly of the citizens, where he eagerly inquired, whether there were any present who could complain of having received an injury from him, that he might ask pardon. Tears and sobs were his only reply. Even in this hour of distress, almost of despair, the sovereign drew consolation from the knowledge that he was the beloved of his people, and that he well deserved their love. From thence he proceeded, accompanied by a band of self-doomed martyrs, to the Church of Saint-Sophia, where the holy sacrament was for the last time administered. The impressive scene in the cathedral is nobly described by Mrs. Hemans :

" 'Tis a proud vision—that most regal pile
 Of ancient days !—The lamps are streaming bright
 From its rich altar, down each pillar'd aisle,
 Whose vista fades in dimness ; but the sight
 Is lost in splendours, as the wavering light
 Develops, on those walls, the thousand dyes
 Of the vein'd marbles, which array their height,
 And from yon dome, the load-star of all eyes
 Pour such an iris-glow as emulates the skies.

 But gaze thou not on these ; though heaven's own hues
 In their soft clouds and radiant tracery vie ;
 Though tints of sun-beam glory may suffuse
 Arch, column, rich mosaic : pass thou by
 The stately tombs, where eastern Cæsars lie,
 Beneath their trophies ; pause not here, for know,
 A deeper source of all sublimity
 Lives in man's bosom, than the world can show,
 In nature or in art, above, around, below.

 Turn thou to mark (though tears may dim thy gaze)
 The steel-clad group before yon altar stone ;
 Heed not, though gems of gold around it blaze,
 Those heads unhelm'd, those kneeling forms alone,
 Thus bow'd, look glorious here. The light is thrown
 Full from the shrine on one, a nation's lord,
 A sufferer !—but his task shall soon be done—
 E'en now, as Faith's mysterious cup is pour'd,
 See to that noble brow, peace, not of earth, restor'd.

The rite is o'er. The band of brethren part,
 Once—and *but* once—to meet on earth again !
 Each in the strength of a collected heart,
 To dare what man may dare—and know 'tis vain !
 The rite is o'er : and thou majestic fane !
 The glory is departed from thy brow !
 Be clothed with dust !—the Christian's farewell strain
 Hath died within thy walls : thy cross must bow :
 Thy kingly tombs be spoil'd ; thy golden shrines laid low."

We have often indulged the melancholy pleasure of endeavouring to imagine this sad and striking scene ; the circumstances are so wholly without a parallel in the annals of the world—they illustrate so completely the superiority of the Christian over the Heathen hero—they show religion triumphant at the moment when all things merely human portended hopeless ruin. Sweet was thy consolation, last and best of an illustrious race ; thy course was run in sorrow—a few brief pangs more and thy reward is won ! Even the sceptic Gibbon was moved while he narrated this solemn act of devotion, and seems half-ashamed of the sneer which pollutes his description. Nothing can be imagined more heart-rending than the sight of the emperor kneeling amid the tombs of his illustrious ancestors, with whose ashes he knew that *his* should never mingle ; bowing before the altar whose riches and wealth were soon to be desecrated, and attended by a crowd whose love for the Church of Saint Sophia was as strong as that which the Jews felt for their temple. "The emperor wept bitterly," says Phranza. Doubtless he did : who would not weep in reading the story "But he rose from his knees with a calm countenance." The calmness was and could be only of that kind which "cometh from above." Ere midnight arrived, its last Christian congregation passed from beneath the dome of Saint Sophia, and *Ichabod* was written on "the giant pile."

The fatal morning arrived. No gun, as usual, from the Turkish camp announced the break of day ; but a sudden rush towards the walls at once aroused the garrison, and the work of death was begun. The engines of ancient and modern warfare united to deal destruction—cannon roared, catapults hurled stones, bullets and arrows flew through the air. The Greek fire, like our modern rockets, darted athwart the sky, adding a new light to the day : the ships in the harbour joined the attack ; sea, land, and sky bore a share in the fearful combat. Well and bravely did the Christians maintain their posts, especially the Imperial Guards and the Genoese auxiliaries. High over the tumult was heard the voice of Constantine cheering his men, using almost the very words that the American Pindar, as Fitz-Greene Hallock is not unjustly called, has ascribed to Marco Bozzaris :

"Strike—till the last arm'd foe expires,
 Strike—for your altars and your fires,
 Strike—for the green graves of your sires,
 God—and your native land."

The sun had risen upon the earth, and yet it was not day. Ramparts and walls were involved in clouds of smoke and dust which the eye could not penetrate; but the Christians still maintained their ground. But now the trenches were choked with dead, and the heaps of Moslems piled beneath the wall afforded ghastly means of ascent to the Janissaries, whom Mohammed led forward in person, after the Anatolian and Rumelian divisions of his troops were driven back. At this critical moment, Justiniani was severely wounded, and retired to seek medical aid: the Genoese, no longer encouraged by his presence, gave ground, and the Turks effected a lodgment on the outer wall.

Let us do justice to a brave and injured man. Gibbon, whose capricious malignity is not the least stain on his great work, accuses, in no very measured terms, Justiniani of cowardice, and ascribes to him the loss of the city. There is absolutely nothing to justify such a suspicion; for Phranza, on whose evidence the charge rests, was not present. Ducas does not even hint at the charge; and the Chian annalist, quoted as an additional authority, only blames the general for not remaining to die at his post. But the Turkish historians unanimously assert, that a portion of the Greeks, seized with sudden terror, submitted to the Turks, and consequently, that Grecian treachery, not Genoese cowardice, enabled the assailants to gain the wall. Ducas partially confirms this account, though love of country induces him to slur it over as lightly as possible.

The lodgment of the Turks within the line of fortifications being once made good, further defence was impossible. In the words of Campbell:

"The storm prevails, the rampart yields away,
Bursts the loud cry of horror and dismay!
Hark! as the smouldering piles with thunder fall,
A thousand shrieks for hopeless mercy call!
Earth shook—red meteors flash'd along the sky,
And conscious Nature shudder'd at the cry."

In the tremendous rush of the Turks, Constantine was borne back by the crowd, and for a time was unable to move a limb from the pressure. The dread of being taken a prisoner, and made the sport of the conquerors, for a moment overcame all other considerations, and he exclaimed, "Cannot a Christian be found that will cut off my head?" But, ere long, better feelings prevailed; he remembered that while life remained, he had duties to perform, and, tearing off the imperial purple, he placed himself at the head of his diminished guards, and contested every inch of ground in the principal street. When and where the imperial martyr fell is uncertain; but most of the historians justify the picture drawn by Mrs. Hemans, describing him as falling mid a heap of foes, in the red grave that his own valour had dug:

"But thou! that on thy ramparts proudly dying,
As a crown'd leader in such hour should die,

Upon thy pyre of shiver'd spears art lying,
 With the heavens o'er thee for a canopy,
 And banners for thy shroud !—No tear, no sigh,
 Shall mingle with thy dirge ; for thou art now
 Beyond vicissitude ! Lo ! rear'd on high,
 The Crescent blazes while the Cross must bow ;
 But where no change can reach, there Constantine art thou !"

There were many Greeks, even in this the last stage of their degeneracy, that emulated the heroism of the emperor, and made desperate resistance in scattered bands. As was said of Ismail :

" The city's taken—only part by part—
 And earth is drunk with gore : there's not a street
 Where fights not to the last some desperate heart
 For those, for whom it soon shall cease to beat."

A scene now occurred precisely similar to one of the most affecting incidents recorded in the sack of Jerusalem. The Byzantines crowded to Saint Sophia, as the Jews did to the Temple, trusting that some miraculous interference would rescue its shrines from the pollution of the Moslemim :

" Twelve thousand monks," says Evliya, " who dwelt within and all around it, having closed its doors, threw from the roof, turrets, towers, and belfries, arrows and burning pitch, and blazing naphtha, on the Faithful."

We have already quoted the singular legend, that Constantinople could not be taken for fifty days, because it contained within its walls a man of remarkable piety. Evliya thus relates the conclusion of the tale :

" When Sultan Mohammed was going in solemn procession round Aga Sofiyah (St. Sophia), a flash of lightning was seen to strike a place called Terlu-direk (the sweating column), and, on going thither, they found a body lying with its face turned towards the *kibleh* (place to which Moslems turn in prayer, being the supposed direction of the Temple of Mecca), written on its illuminated breast, in crimson characters, the name Yá Vúdud (O all-loving!). Ak-Shemsu-d-din, Karah Shemsu-d-din, and the other seventy holy men exclaimed, " This, O Emperor ! was the cause of Islam-bol's falling on the fiftieth day." Having prayed that it might fall in fifty days, on that very day he resigned his soul and bore his prayer to heaven. Then while all those learned, righteous, and excellent men were making the necessary preparations for washing that noble corpse, a voice was heard from the corner of the Terlu-direk, saying, " He is washed and received into mercy ; now therefore inter him." All were breathless with astonishment : and those venerable sheikhs having placed the illustrious corpse of Yá Vúdud on a bier, proceeded to the stairs of Emir Oni, where the bier was put into a boat, which instantly, without an oar plyed, or a sail set, flew like lightning, and did not stop till it came near the tomb of Abú Jyyúb Ensari (on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus) ; there they buried him."

A much more extraordinary narrative of Greek superstition, having the additional recommendation of truth, remains to be told. Ducas, in graphic language, relates the "wild and wondrous history:

"As fugitives from the walls ran, covered with dust and blood, through the streets, they were asked by the women what was the matter? When, in reply, they gave the fearful answer that the enemy were within the walls. The news was generally discredited, and reproaches were heaped upon the wretches as cowards and runaways; but when fresh victims, covered with blood and dust, coming up, confirmed the tale, they perceived that the cup of servitude was brought to their lips. Then all the men, women, monks, and nuns, rush towards the cathedral; fathers and mothers leaving their houses desolate, speeded, with children in their arms, towards the holy sanctuary, so that the whole street leading to St. Sophia was thronged. But why did they thus rush to the cathedral? Many years before, they had heard from some false prophets, that Byzantium should fall before the Turks, and that these ruthless foes, breaking through the walls, should chase the Romans (Greeks) with great slaughter, as far as the pillar of Constantine; but that, when they reached that monument, an angel should descend from heaven, who should give a drawn sword and the right of empire to a man previously obscure, sunk in wretchedness and abject poverty, who should be found standing by the pillar, addressing him in these words: 'Receive this sword, and avenge the people of God!' The impostors added, that the Turks should immediately turn their backs, and be driven, not only from the city, but from the regions of the west, from all Anatolia, and from their possessions in the east, as far as the town of Monodendrium in Persia. Believing in the truth of this prediction, multitudes fled into the cathedral, and invited others to follow."

Assuredly it required little prophetic skill to discover the certain fate of Constantinople for half a century before its fall, and to find out that nothing but a miracle could save its degenerate citizens. It is, however, very singular that the Turks have inherited this prophecy in very nearly the same terms, believing that the Russians shall force a passage into Islámbol, and be victorious up to a certain point, when the prophet, or, as some think, the angel Gabriel, shall interfere, and raise up a deliverer, by whom the Ottoman power shall be elevated to the highest pitch of glory. The chosen deliverer will be, according to the tradition, he whose heart did not fail at the crisis of greatest danger. It is from this superstition that the chief poignancy in the well-known sarcasm is derived:

"Thou who wouldst see this battlement
By Christian cannon piece-meal rent,
Nay, tamely view old Stambol's wall
Before the dogs of Moscow fall,
Nor strike one stroke for life and death
Against the curs of Nazareth."

We must now return to the description of the scenes in the cathedral—still quoting from Ducas:*

“The Turks having reached the cathedral, cut down the gates with their axes, and then entered with drawn swords; and having cast a glance at the assembled multitude, proceeded to seize them separately as slaves, without encountering any resistance. Who can describe such ruin and calamity? Who can pourtray the lamentable exclamations and the wail of infants?—who the tears of mothers and the anguish of fathers? The Turk, with sacrilegious hand, seizes on every nun of delicate form or beautiful person; one carries off his victim bound; another, more powerful, snatches her away. The curling hair, the naked breast, the extended arms offer fresh inducements to the plunderers. The mistress was bound with her servant; the master with his purchased slave; the priest with the porter at the gate; young men were linked in the chain with virgins, on whose complexions the sun had never shone—whose faces their fathers had scarcely beheld; and stripes were inflicted on their tender flesh if they dared to offer resistance. The space of an hour was sufficient for these robbers, the commissioned instruments of Divine vengeance, to bind the whole multitude—the men with ropes, the women with their own shawls and fillets. Then might be seen the long ranks of those chained together issuing from the temple and shrines, weeping and lamenting, while there was no one to pity their distress. Of the temple itself, what shall I say? My tongue cleaves to my jaws—my soul sinks within me. Those dogs broke in pieces the sacred images, having first stripped off their precious ornaments; they destroyed some of the lamps, and took others away; in an instant they plundered completely all the treasures that were kept in the sanctuary, rich vases of gold and silver, vestments and precious ornaments; rendering the noble structure a desert. Then was fulfilled in the new Zion what God had spoken by the mouth of the prophet Amos: ‘In the day that I shall visit the transgressions of Israel upon him, I will visit also the altars of Bethel, and the horns of the altar shall be cut off and fall to the ground. And I will smite the winter-house with the summer-house; and the houses of ivory shall perish, and the great houses shall have an end, saith the Lord.’ (iii. 14, 15.) ‘Though ye offer me burnt-offerings and meat-offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs, for I will not hear the melody of thy viols.’ (v. 22, 23.) ‘The Lord said unto me, The end is come upon my people of Israel; I will not pass by them any more. And the songs of the temple shall be howlings in that day, saith the Lord God; there shall be many dead bodies in every place; they shall cast them forth with silence. Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail; saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn, and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat; making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and

* Ducas quotes from the Septuagint; we have followed the English version.

falsifying the balances by deceit; that we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes; yea, and sell the refuse of the wheat. . . . And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in clear day; and I will turn your feasts into mourning, and all your songs into lamentation.' (viii. 4. 10.) It happened that the awful day on which the city was destroyed was the commemoration of St. Theodosius, at which solemnity a great crowd was assembled, and many men and women had kept the vigil of the feast; many also, in the morning, accompanying their husbands, in their best attire, suddenly fell into the snares of the Turks; for how could they imagine that the wrath of God could in an instant pervade the entire city? Those who have dwelt in it well know how vast its size."

Long before noon the Turks were masters of the entire city; but the sun was declining in the west ere massacre and plunder were, from very weariness, relinquished. Mohammed then entered the city in triumph, and proceeded to the palace. When he came within the marble precincts, soiled with gore and piled with dead, he was struck at the melancholy proof before him of the vicissitudes of human greatness, and repeated the well-known Persian distich:

"The spider hath woven his web in the palace of the Cæsars,
And the owl sung her watch-song on the towers of Afrasiab."

But Mohammed was a cruel and licentious conqueror; his momentary emotion being passed, he devoted himself to the gratification of his avarice and his appetites with a ferocity which even Turks can rarely parallel. But we have already had more than enough of horrors, and we must now direct our attention to the effect of the fall of the Greek empire on the nations of the west. Before doing so, it may be remarked that the names of Augustus, Constantine, Mohammed, Toguel, and Kaiomers, commence and close the series of the Roman, Byzantine, Seljuic, and Persian dynasties; and it seems no improbable surmise, that the present Turkish Sultan will increase the number of these casual coincidences, and terminate the dynasty of the Ottomans in Europe with a Mohammed as it began.

It deserves also to be noticed that Mohammed II., Pope Sextus IV., and Louis XI. of France, died in the same year—"Thus," as Cosier quaintly remarks, "destroying the strong resemblance that had for some years existed between earth and hell." Vidéallan's* account of the three sovereigns will aptly introduce us to the politics of western Europe at this period.

"These three men, celebrated in very different respects, agitated the world without enlightening it. The conquests of the Ottoman prince were sullied by the most atrocious barbarities; and the Christians who were the

* *Histoire Politique de l'Eglise. Vol. II.*

victims of his ambition never learned to unite against their great oppressor. Sixtus IV. polluted the throne of St. Peter, whose usurped power was beginning to be sapped by the increase of knowledge. He seemed anxious to bequeath the Papacy, as the kings of France, of the first race, did their dominions, in gavelkind; he gave the signal and the scandal of pontifical inheritance; his nephews (?) were invested with the patrimony of the church. Louis XI. was never baffled, except by the artifices of the Cardinal Balue, and the resentment that he consequently felt against the court of Rome was of long duration. Perhaps it was the only one of his sentiments that he ever allowed to be discovered. But his menaces were always as vain as his services were unseasonable. His great object was to establish the despotism of the Lower (Byzantine) empire. Cruel, superstitious, inflexible, he sported with promises, oaths, and the lives of men; and if he ever asked forgiveness, in moments of scruple and terror, it was doubtless for not having sufficiently dissembled."

The exiles from Constantinople arrived in Italy, when the minds of men were just beginning to emancipate themselves from the thralldom of scholastic theology, and when the crimes of the Papacy, fast approaching the summit of their greatness, had driven men to enquire on what foundations the claims of the pontiffs rested. They brought with them the knowledge of the Greek language, and its study rapidly became popular with their hosts. It required no very deep study of the New Testament to discover that the ecclesiastical establishments which then overshadowed Europe, and blighted every healthy plant that sprung beneath their shade, were directly inconsistent with the spirit and letter of the Gospel. The fall of Constantinople filled Christendom, but more especially eastern Germany, with terror. Mohammed, indeed, had open for himself a passage into Italy, by the capture of Otranto; and, but for his sudden death, might have occupied the ruined halls of the Cæsars, as well as the palaces of the Constantines, and placed the crescent on St. Peter's as on St. Sophia. The Popes preached a new crusade; money was collected to subsidize troops; but the pontiffs used the treasures to enrich their families, to provide for their natural children, or to forward their schemes of ambition. Two years after Mohammed's death, the Turks might have been driven beyond the Hellespont—perhaps beyond the Euphrates, had Innocent VIII. been less avaricious, and the Venetians less influenced by commercial jealousy. Innocent did not even condescend to use the decent excuses of Sixtus; he publicly recognised his natural children, and filled Italy with cruel wars by his efforts to carve out principalities for them. The establishment of the Turks in Europe brought shame and sorrow to every Christian country, and the blame being justly cast upon the rulers of the Church, there was consequently a growing disposition to scrutinize severely the origin of privileges profligately abused, and the source of an authority exercised, not for conservation, but destruction. An atrocious violation of the laws of hospitality, combined with im-

policy, injustice, and a wanton sacrifice of the interest of Christendom, greatly increased the alienation of many powerful minds from the Papacy. The crime was commenced by Innocent, and consummated by Alexander; it brought to them but slight and temporary advantage; it irretrievably ruined the character of pontifical power.

Jem Shah, or Zimzim, as he was called by the Italians, was the son of Mohammed II. by some Christian princess. Evliya is of course mistaken, when he says the mother of Jem was the daughter of the King of France; and the source of his error is clearly the common oriental blunder of calling all European sovereigns, whether emperors, kings, or dukes, monarchs of Frangistán. We are unable to discover who the princess really was. Constantinople, at the time of its fall, contained many ladies closely allied to the sovereigns of western Europe, more than one of whom became tenants of the imperial harem. Jem Shah rebelled against his brother, Bayazid II.; was defeated at the battle of Karamán, and fled to Egypt. After having made the pilgrimage to Mecca, he visited western Europe, hoping to obtain aid from the Christian princes against his brother. Bayazid, in alarm, sent emissaries to different courts, but in Rome alone did he find an effective ally. Jem had sought shelter with the knights of Rhodes, and was kept by them in the castle of Auvergne. Innocent was resolved to obtain possession of his person, and intrigued for the purpose with Charles VIII. and the Grand Master. His motives are very ably stated by Vidaillan, a Roman Catholic historian :

"The Pope (Innocent VIII.) deemed no political affair beyond his province. He long entreated Charles VIII. to consign the unfortunate Zimzim to his custody, who had sought refuge first in Rhodes, and afterwards in France. The possession of this prince was eagerly sought by all the enemies of the Turks and Bayazid. The Sultan of Egypt had often sought possession of his person, as a means of defending his states, and protecting the family of Lusignan, which still contested with the barbarians the possession of Cyprus. Innocent continually pretended that he was anxious for a new crusade, and demanded the tenths (of all ecclesiastical benefices) for the purpose; to such exactions the parliament of France was inflexibly opposed; but Charles VIII. permitted the knights of Rhodes to send Zimzim to Rome; the consent of the Grand Master was purchased by a cardinal's hat. The Ottoman prince, more haughty in misfortune than Christian monarchs on the throne, refused to kiss the feet of the Pope, and purchase hospitality by abasement. His brother pursued him every where, and the Italian land offered him the best chances for assassination."*

The Pope, however, protected his life, not from respect to the laws of hospitality, but, as Vidaillan proves, from mean and mercenary motives.

"Innocent, for keeping the prince a close prisoner, received from Bayazid a pension of forty thousand crowns annually, and yet never ceased from his exhortations to take up arms against the Turk. But his sincerity was suspected, when it was known of what value to him was the presence of a guest so likely to be of service at the head of a Christian fleet or army. In vain did the Sultan of Egypt promise an enormous sum, and, what ought to have decided (one who claimed to be) the vicar of Jesus Christ, the possession of Jerusalem, which had cost Europe so many armies and so much treasures, and the sovereign pontiffs so many prayers; the pension paid by Bayazid was something substantial, which could not be overbalanced by the expectations and hopes offered by the Egyptian. It was in vain that Innocent had reason to fear the attempts of poisoners—that he once punished an assassin sent to rid the Turk of his fears; he kept fast hold of Zim-zim, received the tribute from Bayazid, levied the tenths to make war against him, and exhorted the Christian monarchs to commence it. But other events were preparing in Italy; and Bayazid, assured of the intentions of Innocent, was able at his pleasure to ravage Hungary and invade Germany. The Pope was his most powerful auxiliary."

Can we be surprised that the next century witnessed the Reformation? and that Germany, thus at once plundered, insulted and betrayed, should produce the great reformer?

During the popedom of Alexander Borgia, the successor of Innocent, Charles VIII. invaded Italy, and forced the Pope to submit to his terms. Sismondi's account of the manner in which Borgia became the victim of his own artifices is very amusing.

"The Pope (Alexander VI.) was the dupe of his own policy. Devoid of principle, destitute of shame, incapable of scruple, he had acquired a character for cunning simply because he always attended to his own interests. But he had not formed a just idea of the power against which he measured himself; and for a moderate profit he hazarded a game that might have been very ruinous. He began to intrigue with France merely to terrify Ferdinand (King of Naples); he afterwards sold his friendship to the latter for favours granted to his natural children."*

Thus having brought Charles into Italy, with overwhelming forces, by one intrigue, he made that monarch his enemy by a second, and was fairly entangled in his own meshes. He was forced to give up Jem Shah, as one of the conditions of peace; but he caused poison to be administered to the prince, who died of its effects in the French camp at Capua. Evliya says, that Jem Shah was murdered by the Frankish monarch, at the instigation of Bayazid.

"The ill-complexioned Frank caused a sallow-faced fellow to cut his throat while shaving him with a poisoned razor. . . . There was a certain

* Histoire des Français. Vol. XV.

barber, named Yâs Oghli, who shaved him with a poisoned razor, which made his face and eyes swell, and he was suffocated."

This statement fully confirms the unanimous account given by the western historians, that Jem was the victim of treachery. We have already said that the Pope was called King of Frangistan by the Orientals, who know of no distinction between Christian sovereigns.

With the murder of Jem Shah, terminated the hopes of the re-establishment of the Greek empire. Charles VIII. had declared that he would invade Greece, accompanied by this prince; and associates were formed from the Balkan to Cape Matapan for a general insurrection; but Charles came not, and Bayazid wreaked his vengeance on the discontented. More than twenty thousand Christians perished on the scaffold (Maseray says fifty thousand), victims of papal duplicity. But let not Borgia alone engross the infamy; the Republic of Venice shared deeply in the guilt; her nobles became spies for the Porte, and revealed to Bayazid the names of those who had planned a revolt. It is gratifying to find that such crimes passed not without retribution. The poisoner of Jem Shah died of poison, which he had prepared for another. Greece is now free, and Venice sunk into hopeless thralldom and degradation.

W. C. T.

THE CHURCH AND THE HOME MISSION.*

ATTACHED to the Established Church Home Mission, we were grieved to have put into our hands a pamphlet against it, addressed, by a clergyman of the diocese of Raphoe, to his clerical brethren of that diocese. We were sorry to find a clergyman of our church at once expressing himself, in a few words, fully acquainted with the important object which the Home Mission has in view, and deliberately sitting down to endeavour to impede its progress and defeat its purpose, without, at the same time, giving even a hint how, by other instrumentality, its important objects can be carried into execution.

Indeed, so far as appears in the reverend author's pamphlet, if he could uphold and maintain what he considers (we think very erroneously) the perfection of ecclesiastical discipline, he would not care if souls were left to perish. We premise, that we do not impute this disregard to souls to the author, but to his pamphlet, in which he states distinctly the object of the Home Mission—gives it the full measure of his approbation, and then spends all his pages in arguing against the mission which aims at this excellent object, without one attempt to show that there is other machinery in operation to attain the object, or without proposing any other means for its attainment. And then what is the ground of his argument against the mission, whose object he admits to be so excellent? That it violates his views of church discipline—views which we feel a perfect confidence that we can prove to be most mistaken and erroneous.

We shall let our author speak for himself as to the excellence of the object of the Home Mission :

"The object of the Home Mission may be described in a few words; it is to spread the knowledge and the belief of the religion of Christ throughout the land. Such an object is worthy of the best exertions that man can employ for its attainment. Every Christian, every minister of Christ especially, must approve and applaud the design. On this part of the inquiry, therefore, I deem it to be quite unnecessary to dwell, as every one of you, my brethren, would undoubtedly regard it as the true and solid foundation of the happiness of our country, if that Gospel, which it is the business of us all to preach, were clearly, and plainly, and purely imprinted on the minds of all our countrymen, and placed in their hearts, to be as a 'fountain of living water, springing up into everlasting life.' I shall, therefore, proceed to the second point which I proposed for inquiry, the authority by which the Home Mission is founded."

* The Church and the Home Mission, addressed by the Author to his highly esteemed brethren, the Clergy of the Diocese of Raphoe. Londonderry. 1894.

We could not say any thing better as to the excellence of the object. Now, we are as far as possible from maintaining that the end will justify the means; but this we will say, that when a man acknowledges such excellence, such eternal importance in the end, he should not be satisfied with finding fault with the means used by excellent and devoted servants of the Lord, and, as far as he is concerned, leave the question in this state before his readers. The means are objectionable; therefore abandon the excellent object. If the pamphlet we have under review could produce any effect, and, as far as it shall produce any effect, it will be this: The means used by the Home Mission are objectionable; therefore, be still and do nothing towards imprinting that Gospel on the minds of all our countrymen, which it is the business of us all to preach, and which, being preached, would produce the solid and true foundation of the happiness of our country. The paramount importance of the object of the mission is admitted by the author himself. He was bound, then, to say, "Its object ought to be attained; its object must be pursued. I object to the peculiar means employed by the Home Mission; I will point out a more excellent way; I will prove the means now in hands, independent of missionary exertions, are adequate (this we would defy any man to prove); or I will show a new plan of operation more free from objection."

But no; as far as his pamphlet is concerned, he would turn men from promoting the excellent object of the mission through its means; and if he succeeds in that, he leaves the object which he so praises without proposing any means for its attainment.

But we proceed to consider his objections to the peculiar means employed by the Home Mission.

There are some statements as to fact upon which our author appears to be mistaken, and which we would begin by correcting.

We find (p. 6.) the following questions and answers:

"With whom did the system of the Home Mission originate? With private individual ministers in the church. By whom was it planned? By private individual ministers in the church. Who gave it form and consistency, and inspired it with life? Private individual ministers in the church. Who carry it into operation? Private individual ministers in the church. Who govern, and direct, and control it? Private individual ministers in the church.

"In this system, which, from the manner of its establishment and of its management, I must call a bold and daring novelty in our church, I cannot perceive the guiding hand of public authority. I see nothing but the operation of private individuals; I look for the sanction of superior power, but I see none."

We beg leave to set our author right upon this point. The first step taken by the originators of the Home Mission, was to wait upon their diocesan, at that time his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Magee. They laid before him their object, which

he highly praised, and their proposed means, which he cordially approved. The thing was not done in a corner; they published a prospectus of their plan, and his Grace's approbation, during his life-time; and under his sanction they made their first attempt to enlarge their sphere of labour, and to add to their pastoral duties the voluntary work of the missionary. Let no honest fair objector henceforward say, through ignorance, "I look for the sanction of superior power, but I see none." The conductors of the Home Mission took not one step without the sanction of superior power.

Our author, starting with ignorance of fact, proceeds to support the cause he has undertaken by reasonings and theories, totally disregarding facts. He would put down the practical operation of the Home Mission upon theory, instead of going to the facts of the case and considering the bearing of the Mission upon things as they are, and considering how far, whatever may be novel in its proceedings, is really called for by the altered state of things. He gives us much of the canons of the church in her earlier days, as well as the canons of our own church. We would say, respectfully, that with the first we really do not think we have any thing to do in the present inquiry, and with the second we have to do only in a modified way, as time and the usage of the church has conformed them to the present exigency. Upon this last point we shall be obliged to be more explicit and at length in the sequel of our remarks; but before we proceed with our author, who would put down that which he himself acknowledges to be a good work, for the good of man and the glory of God, by quotations of human laws, ancient ecclesiastical constitutions, and church canons, we would remark, that it is the quality of divine law alone never to change—never to become obsolete. God, in his infinite, allwise mind, sees before him at once the future as well as the present; known unto him are all his works; nothing comes unforeseen and unprovided; and, therefore, what he establishes as law, being laid down in the full view of the future, suits all times and all circumstances; and, therefore, at all times, and after the lapse of ever so much time, it will prove the guilt and the impropriety of any act or any course of conduct, that it is opposed to God's eternal law. But human laws, when enacted by the highest human wisdom, are not enacted with this divine foresight, whether they be laws of a state or canons of a church; they may suit the present circumstances, but they cannot provide for future emergency. Therefore it is that human laws are continually being changed, some by positive enactment, some by being allowed to fall into disuse and become obsolete. It was no proof of the deep wisdom of the Medes and Persians that their laws altered not with altering circumstances; and it is no proof of deep wisdom, with the full view of altered circumstances before their eyes, to wish to have things now regulated by human laws and canons made many centuries back.

It is a very weak argument, we conceive, that can be drawn

against the proceedings of the Home Mission, in 1834, that they do not exactly suit the spirit of the times or the letter of the canons of the church in the first centuries. It is saying nothing against the piety or the wisdom of those excellent men; it is saying nothing more than that they were human, to say, that they did not contemplate, did not foresee such a state of things as the nominal Christian world exhibits in our country at the present day. The same we ought to say of the framers of our canons. They were men of piety, men of learning, men of wisdom; excellent for the time they lived; but will any one say, that they contemplated the present state of things? There is one thing, whether it be good or evil, of which certainly they had no idea, and that was, *toleration—legal, unrestricted liberty to every man to choose for himself his religion, and the forms of his religion*; of this they had no idea, and for this state of things they made no provision in their enactments.

Let us only consider Canon 9th: "Whosoever shall separate themselves from the communion of saints, as it is approved by the Apostles' rules, in the Church of England, and combine themselves in a new brotherhood, accounting the Christians who are conformable to the doctrine, government, rites, and ceremonies of the Church of England, to be profane, and unmeet for them to join with in Christian profession, let them be excommunicated *ipso facto*, and not restored, but by the Archbishop, after their repentance and public revocation of such their wicked errors."

Would those pious, wise, spiritual men, who drew up this canon, make it one of the canons of our Church at the present day? Assuredly not. It may be useful to remark, that the canons breathed evidently the spirit of the laws that were framed about the same time. By the 1 E. II. it was enacted that all persons, having no lawful or reasonable excuse to be absent, shall resort to their parish church, and there abide orderly and soberly during the time of the common prayer, preaching, &c. "on pain of punishment by the censure of the church, and also on pain of forfeiting twelve pence for ever such offence." Whilst this state of things existed, it was quite in accordance with the law that the canons should prohibit the clergy from preaching in private houses; when all the population were forced to congregate themselves in the public church, it was quite fitting that ministers should not draw men from the church by preaching elsewhere; but when that state of things is entirely altered, and all men are at perfect liberty to absent themselves from the public worship in the church, it does not follow that ministers should be prevented from addressing them in other places, in order to bring them back to the worship of the church. When there is nothing to compel the sheep to keep within the fold, would it not be reasonable that there should be nothing to prevent the shepherd from going after the sheep? Would not the same wise men, famous in their generation, who, when the sheep were confined, confined also the shepherds, now that the sheep are scattered, encourage the shep-

herds to scatter likewise and to seek after them. No; according to our author, the canons and constitutions of our church must be like the laws of the Medes and Persians; they must not alter; not one of them must ever be considered obsolete.

On this subject our author is very positive; he says (p. 28): "No, they are not obsolete; laws are never obsolete that can be enforced." What! does he really mean to say, that all the canons are now actually enforced by the authorities of our church, and actually obeyed by the orderly and obedient portion of our ministers? We would ask our author, does he obey them himself? We suppose him to be an orderly and obedient minister, and now we ask him, does he consider all the canons as binding upon him, and, to come to the point, does he obey them? Does he obey, for example, the 74th Canon of the year 1607, that which prescribes a peculiar apparel of the clergy? Does he "wear, in his journey, a cloak with sleeves, commonly called a priest's cloak, with guards, welts, long buttons, or cuts?" Does he say that this canon is not obsolete? Burn says, "The canons for the habit of clergymen are now become matters only of curiosity and speculation." Vol. 3, p. 192. Does he observe the canon for bidding of prayer before sermon? Can. 55. We feel assured he does not; and yet our author is very decided in declaring the absolute obligation that lies upon every clergyman to obey these canons. Indeed, in some places, his arguments are very strange. In p. 15. he says:

"We are under law in this matter; we are under canonical obedience. What does canonical obedience mean? Does it not mean that we are to obey the canons? It may be said, and I believe it has been said, very indeliberately and thoughtlessly I think, that we may proceed till the canons are enforced. What! what kind of a principle, either political, or ecclesiastical, or moral, or religious, is this to propound, that we may transgress laws as long as we can do so with impunity. The very word enforcement includes the idea of punishment; enforcement is in consequence of transgression."

This is certainly to us a new version of canonical obedience. We thought that obedience had respect to the rulers, whom (and not the canons) we were bound to obey, whilst the canon gave the rule by which they were to regulate their demand, and according to which rule we were bound to obey them. For example, had the rulers of our church continued to require the clergy to conform themselves in the matter of apparel to the requirements of the 74th canon, the principle of canonical obedience would have bound the clergy to conform to the things there laid down. But when the rulers of the church have wisely suffered that canon to become obsolete, we do not consider ourselves as transgressing the principle of canonical obedience by being dressed more in the habit of the present day. Our author, indeed, if he is sincere in his expositions of canonical obedience, and if he does

not wear the priest's cloak prescribed, must, in his conscience, be guilty of canonical disobedience; but, for our parts, our consciences do not accuse us on this head; and we cannot but think his exposition of enforcing the law is as novel as his exposition of canonical obedience. "The very word enforcement," he says, "includes punishment." We beg leave to dissent. The enforcing of a law does not imply the inflicting punishment for past transgression, but only the authoritative demand of future obedience. Should, for example, the rulers of our church enforce the 74th Canon, it would not be necessary they should punish our author for his past transgression, if it but merely demand his future observance; and that canonical obedience does not mean a literal observance of the canons, and that proceeding till the canons are enforced, is not said quite so indeliberately and thoughtlessly as our author would suggest, he himself gives us a proof, by a very apt quotation from Burn, which we have p. 24:

"'But,' says Burn, in his *Ecclesiastical Law*, 'the occasion of these canons being now taken away, the bishops do generally and justly forbear to put the canons in this matter in execution.'"

According to Burn, bishops may justly forbear to put into execution canons the occasions of which have been taken away; and surely the clergy are not canonically disobedient to their bishops when they do not conform to canons which the others justly forbear to put in execution.

We have dwelt so long on this subject in order to show, and we trust successfully, that even could it be proved much more satisfactorily than it has, that the letter of the canons of the primitive church, or even of our own church, were against the proceedings of the Home Mission, still the altered state of things might make it just and wise in bishops to forbear to put the canons in execution; and no canonical disobedience could be justly charged against ministers under such circumstances, even if it could be proved that they transgressed their letter, whilst they were in full accordance with their spirit.

We shall now proceed to consider some of the specific grounds of accusation brought forward by our author. We shall give his own list of crimes (p. 22):

"Let us now proceed to inquire into the mode adopted by the Home Mission of carrying their plan into effect. Certain beneficed clergymen are sent through every province of Ireland, perhaps through every diocese, to preach. 1st. They leave their own charges to act as ministers elsewhere. 2dly. In some parishes they have the permission and approbation of the clergyman. 3dly. But where they have not the permission or approbation of the minister of the parish, and even where the bishop disapproves, they sometimes force their way. 4thly. They preach in school-houses and in other places not permitted by authority as places of divine service. 5thly. They prefer these places to the church."

After a paragraph upon obedience, in which our author again says that canonical obedience is obeying the canons, he proceeds seriatim:—

“First—They leave their own charges to act, at stated times, as ministers elsewhere. In the ordination service the bishop says to him whom he is ordaining as priest, ‘Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments, in the congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereto.’ By this the priest acquires the capacity or power of preaching only in that congregation to which he is lawfully appointed,” &c.

Here is the main accusation against the ministers engaged in the Home Mission, and here is the strong argument by which our author endeavours to stop them in their labour of love. The Home Missionaries admit the fact, that they do occasionally leave their own charges to act as ministers, missionaries elsewhere. Other ministers often leave their charges for a season on private business, for recreation, some for amusement, &c. These leave their charges to preach the Gospel in other places, not to recreate, but for a time to work harder than they have done before. They leave their charges for one Sunday, having taken care that their place shall be well supplied, to preach, in less than a fortnight, twenty or twenty-four sermons to perishing sinners; “to seek for Christ’s sheep that be dispersed abroad, and for his children that be in the midst of this naughty world.” (Ordaining of priests.) “Such an object,” our author says, in his opening page, “is worthy of the best exertions that man can employ for its attainment.”

But he would maintain that no minister ordained in the Church of England had received authority to do this good work, and in proof he quotes the charge given him by the bishop at ordination; having pointed this charge in a way to give it, if possible, a meaning favourable to his view of the case:

“Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments, in the congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereto.”

In order to make this ordination charge appear to confine the preaching the word to the congregation to which the minister shall be lawfully appointed, our author puts a stop after “sacraments,” which is not found in any copy of the Prayer-book to which we have access. We have before us a prayer-book of Edward VI., of Charles I. and of Charles II., and in them all the charge runs:

“Take thou authority to preach the word, and to minister the holy sacraments in the congregation,” &c.

According to this last pointing the charge gives universal right to preach the word, and a right to minister the holy sacra-

ments in the congregation ; and that there is some importance in the pointing, appears from this very circumstance of our author having altered the pointing, as far as we know, without any authority. We do not say that no edition of the Prayer-book has the words so pointed, but we say that the early editions we have an opportunity of consulting all have it differently from our author, and in referring to Bishop Mant's Prayer-book we find he has no "comma" between "sacraments" and "in the congregation." It reads thus in his prayer-book :

"Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments in the congregation, where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereto."

This is no special pleading about a point ; this is a most important consideration as to the spiritual power conferred on a minister at his ordination. It is worthy of serious attention. Our author would maintain that no ordained priest has obtained by his ordination a right to preach out of his own congregation. He has not considered the lengths to which the concession of this would lead. There is no juster rule admitted in reasoning than that that argument which proves too much proves nothing. Our author's argument proves too much : it proves that ordination in our church gives to *no man* a right to preach anywhere but in one congregation ; neither to priest nor bishop. If we look to the consecration of bishops we shall find no authority given them for preaching, larger or more extensive, than that which they received when they were ordained priests. If when they were ordained priests they only received authority to preach, limited to one congregation, when they are bishops they have no larger commission as to preaching. Again, if the charge in the ordination service intends only what our author maintains, then our church has no form for ordaining any one to be a missionary. It is not only that the ministers connected with the Home Mission are preaching without having obtained at their ordination authority to do so, but all the ministers sent out by those Missionary Societies particularly connected with our Church, as, for example, by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, have been sent by the leaders of our Church, to do that which the ordination of our Church gave them no authority or right to do. If our author's argument is valid it will prove a want of right to preach in our bishops and foreign missionaries, as well as in the ministers connected with the Home Mission. Surely this is proving too much : we must say then that it falls to the ground, and proves nothing. And since our author has quoted the charge delivered by the bishop, having first pointed it so as to alter its meaning, we would quote the words put by our Church into the mouth of the bishop, at the very time of laying his hands upon the candidate for the office of priest :

"Receive the Holy Ghost, for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands."

By these words the ordained minister is made, not the priest of a certain congregation, but the priest of the Church of God : his ordination is universal, and whatever limitation may or may not be proved from other sources, no limitation exists from the nature of his ordination.

Secondly—He objects that the Home Mission enter a parish when they have the permission and approbation of the clergyman. He denies the right of the clergyman to receive a brother minister, and to give him his pulpit without his having the expressed license of the bishop of the diocese in which he wishes to preach. We know that a right is claimed by the bishops in Ireland to forbid the duly licensed and beneficed clergy of any neighbouring diocese to preach in the pulpit of their diocese, but we doubt much the legality of this claim, and we doubt still more the wisdom and policy of this claim, to turn the several dioceses into so many distinct churches that cannot have an exchange of ministrations. In England no such right is claimed. Those that are authorized to preach in one diocese are admitted to preach in another. A clergyman in England can as freely admit a brother from a neighbouring diocese into his pulpit as he can a brother from his own diocese. The Bishop of Peterboro' some years ago attempted to prove his right to hinder a clergyman of his diocese from admitting a regularly authorized clergyman of another into his pulpit, and he brought his action against the clergyman whom he considered as an offender ; but judgment was given against the bishop ; and we have no doubt that if the case was tried here, by an appeal to the law, it would be found that a bishop has no right to prevent the minister of a parish from receiving occasional assistance in his pulpit from a duly qualified clergyman of another diocese. But whatever may yet be determined to be the law upon this point, it bears but little upon the case of the Home Mission. It is charged against them that they preach in school-houses, court-houses, barns, &c., nay, that they prefer these places. They admit the fact. However anxious they are to render every assistance in their power, to the ordinary ministrations of their pious and laborious brethren, their desire is rather to address themselves to those who do not make the stated congregations of the parish church. They know from the experience of their own parishes, and from their personal acquaintance with all parts of Ireland, that a majority of the population never go inside of the church. To these do they desire especially to deliver the message of the gospel of peace ; to these would they speak in love ; and if the Lord should bless them, draw many fellow-sinners to the Saviour, and to the church which they value.

Our author justly fears that the fact of the Reformation in England having been brought about and advanced by itinerant preachers, will appear to be a great argument in favour of the itinerant preaching of the Home Mission ; he, therefore, towards the conclusion of his pamphlet, sets himself, with all his might,

to prove the dissimilarity of the itinerant preaching of those times and of the present. But there are certain facts he cannot by all his attempts get over. He cannot get over this fact, that the ordination of the Church of England, that which he would say does not now authorize a man to preach anywhere but in his own particular charge, was sufficient to give a valid spiritual mission to the itinerants of those days. If Knox and others had the King's license to go through the land preaching, it was not the King's license that conveyed to them any spiritual office, or spiritual authority: it was not the King's license that enlarged the limited authority conveyed to them when the bishop at their ordination ordained them priests of the Church of God, and gave them authority to preach the word. The King's license might secure them protection in the exercise of their ministerial office; but it could convey nothing spiritual; it never pretended to convey any thing spiritual. Whatever right their ordination conveyed to these first itinerants to preach throughout the length and breadth of the land, that same right does the same ordination convey now. But then the objector will say, But you want the King's license. We ask for what? When the civil power restrains no man from preaching; when King, Lords, and Commons, have given, not licenses to individuals, but license to all to preach when, where, and what, they please, why should the clergymen of the Established Church stand in need of that license from the state which every other man has by the law? We shall give our author's own statement of the situation of things in those times:

"Burnet, speaking of the preachers in the reign of Henry VIII. says, 'Now that the Reformation made a greater progress, much pains was taken to send eminent preachers over the nation; not confining them to particular charges, but sending them, *with the King's license*, up and down to many places. But provision was made also for people's daily instruction; and because in that ignorant time, there could not be found a sufficient number of good preachers; and in a time of so much juggling they would not trust the instruction of the people to every one; therefore *none was to preach except he had gotten a particular license for it, from the King, or his diocesan*.' (Burnet's Hist. of the Reformation, v. 1. p. 237, fol. ed.) So much for the necessity of a license at this period of the Reformation, under Henry the VIII. Now, let us see how it was in a better period, under Edward the VI. 'For preventing the mischief occasioned by rash preachers, *none were to preach without license from the King, or his visitors, the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the bishop of the diocese where they lived: excepting only incumbents preaching in their own parishes*; those who preached otherwise were to be imprisoned, till orders were given for their punishment.' (V. 2, p. 46.) This under the reign of Edward the VI. when such a man as Cranmer was archbishop, when the Reformation advanced freely—unrestrained by any of the impediments that had retarded it in the former reign, from the pride of learning, the theological self-sufficiency and caprice of a self-willed, tyrannical monarch—under the calm intelligence of

a spiritually-minded, though youthful king, guided by the learning, the moderation, and the wisdom of Cranmer and his associates. During this same reign *all* preaching was for a time restrained. (Burnet, v. 2, p. 62.) Under the reign of Elizabeth—*She forbid all preaching, except by such as had a license under the great seal.*" (V. 2, p. 288.)

Now, we ask our reverend author, has he quoted this to convey the idea that he would desire this state of things to be restored in these countries, or to imply that this is the state of things at present, if only what he considers the law was put in force?

We do not hesitate to say, that we most heartily rejoice that religion is not now in this state of thralldom to the civil rulers. We bless God that, in our land, the word of God is not so bound. The King has no power to forbid all or any preaching, except by such as have a license under the great seal; and the actual state of things, as our author well knows, is that every man has perfect liberty to preach as he pleases, without seeking any license. It is admitted in the case of every other man, except the ministers of the Church of England. And we would ask our reverend author, is it fair to the Church of England, that every other man should have unlimited right to preach as he pleases, and when and where; but he that would advocate the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, is to be restrained or refused a license? Shall restraint be taken away from every Dissenter, Seceder, Papist, Arian, Socinian?—shall they all have free and unrestricted privilege to poison the minds of the people—to turn them from the truth, and from the church, which is a pillar of truth?—and shall a man, that is a friend to the Established Church, desire to rivet again upon his brethren those chains which law has taken from all others, and which the hand of time has removed from them?

We would refer to one other fact. Our great reformers, "men famous in their generation," in their wisdom, so justly praised, called itinerant preaching as an instrument to dispel the moral and spiritual darkness that hung, in their time, over England. It succeeded; it enlightened the clergy; it instructed and converted the people. Protestant light and scriptural truth spread over England; but those great men never tried the power of itinerant preaching in Ireland. The popish clergy remained unenlightened; the popish people remained uninstructed, unconverted. The country of Ireland is in a state to want itinerant preaching now, as much as England wanted it in former times; and the same results that followed the itinerancy in England then may be expected to follow it in Ireland now. Those that love the darkness better than the light, whether they be in the church or out of the church, will be grieved that men of zeal go forth to teach and to preach in the name of Jesus; but the real friend of the Church of England, the lover of truth, and the disciple of her Lord, will rejoice at the good that is being done, and at that which they hope will yet be accomplished; and, in the spirit of the Apostle, every way that Christ is preached, they do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.

REMARKS ON "BUTLER'S ANALOGY."

PART II. CHAPTER II.

THERE is among sensible men a strong disinclination to believe a supernatural or miraculous narrative. The atheist consistently views it as including an impossibility; but the believer in a God is aware that it contains nothing beyond *his* power to effect, by merely varying our present system, as he formerly *varied* it at the creation.

There is certainly a degree of presumption against this variation on account of its infrequency; but Butler satisfactorily proves the very great disproportion between presumption, however strong, and evidence, however weak; so that even a considerable increase in the amount of the former is of little importance, provided the latter be unimpeachable.

Neither can it be said that, in general, the senses are incapable of appreciating the reality of a miracle. One or more persons are as capable of judging of the identity of an individual seen on several occasions, whether he may have lived uninterruptedly, or died in the interim. It is true, the knowledge of the latter circumstance may make them at first hesitate to credit his identity; but this very *hesitation* becomes a confirmation of the fact, if they are subsequently *convinced* of its reality, as it proves an accuracy of investigation, which, in an *ordinary* case of apparent identity, might be neglected. Besides, a miracle would be as readily and as justly credited as a common matter of fact by the *beholder*. Hence, since neither the presumption against the miracle, nor the difficulty of appreciating its reality are sufficient to attach discredit to it, the latter must depend on a distrust of the *means* whereby the evidence of the senses of the witnesses (or of the alleged witnesses) is conveyed and submitted to our judgment; and if these be wholly unimpeachable, there can be no *reasonable* grounds whatever for withholding our assent from a supernatural narrative. A delusion of the senses is, as has been mentioned, no more probable than with respect to an ordinary matter of fact, provided the examination by the witnesses has not been hasty or superficial. *Miraculous* stories will accordingly be found to be discredited, not on account of their abstract improbability, but because they *have* been found to be specially the subjects of *imposture*; so that where there is *any flaw in the evidence* (and not otherwise), suspicion is reasonably excited; and accordingly we find, that where the *motives* of the witnesses, or of the custodians of evidence, are suspected, even a narrative of an *ordinary* description is as much distrusted nearly as what is supernatural. This is illustrated with respect to the genuineness of religious *relics*, which are in themselves no more *extraordinary* than a mummy or a medal, and yet the legends with respect to them seldom obtain credit from the well-informed. Apparent probability is, indeed, a very precarious test of truth, since it is to that standard that fabricators, in general, en-

deavour to adapt their fictions in order to elude suspicion ; so that in a *questionable* case, presumption is, perhaps, as worthless an argument *pro.* as Butler states it to be *con.* On the other hand, apparent improbability precludes the supposition of, at least, *artful* contrivance, and may thus, in certain cases, rather corroborate the narrative. No story was less likely to obtain credit than that of the resurrection of the material body, which was as repugnant to the notions of the ancients as to our own, and accordingly was received at first with the most absolute incredulity ; and, therefore, the circumstance that this powerful obstacle to belief *was* surmounted, and the fact firmly and considerably *believed* by those who had full access to information, and were deeply interested in knowing *the truth*, enables us to estimate what the strength of the evidence *must* have been.

There is not only, as Butler remarks, no presumption against a *system* of miraculous agency in the early ages of the world ; but there is really a strong presumption in its favour. For this agency having been obviously in operation at the *creation*, we are bound, on strictly philosophical principles, to suppose its *continuance* till such time as its cessation can be proved, and hence not to discredit the testimony of the Scriptures, were it even less trust-worthy than it is, and unconfirmed by the evidence of prophecy, to the fact, that this agency continued to be displayed, at least, at intervals from the era of the creation to that of Christianity ; sometime after which period the evidence becomes more questionable, both as to individual miracles and the continuance of that agency on which all miracles depend. The witnesses were no longer disinterested ; the publicity of the alleged events and of the records became less ; and the purity of the latter was no longer free from suspicion.

Revelation has thus proved an obstacle to the credit that might otherwise have been obtained by several miraculous narratives, by not only establishing a standard of evidence in such cases, any considerable diminution of which is looked on with suspicion, but also by making us acquainted with God's dealings with his creatures, and thus inducing us to hesitate whenever a *deviation* from that system is proposed to our notice. Our experience having proved that the supernatural or miraculous has *never* been had recourse to, whilst the natural was sufficient for the purpose, nor without a distinct avowal of that purpose, and a confirmation of the presence of the supernatural agency in *many* instances and forms, we are distrustful of an allegation that this agency has been manifested in an isolated instance, (to all appearance,) capriciously ; and this distrust is increased, if there be any reason to suppose that the witnesses may have been hasty in their observations, or to suspect the motives of those by whom their evidence is transmitted.

L.

Leslie's arguments as to the *peculiarity* of the evidence of Scripture miracles, in his "*Short and Easy Method with the Deists*," does not admit of abridgment, and leaves nothing to desire.

ON IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—May I request a place in your useful and impartial periodical for the following observations upon an important subject—*imputed righteousness*.

Having arranged the substance of the reasoning here offered, before perusing an Essay on the same subject, by his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, in his work on "Some Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul," &c. in which several of the arguments here adduced are put forward with the usual strength and clearness of the author, I should find it difficult to alter the arrangement without doing injustice to my own view of the question.

The view which I conceive to be most scriptural, and shall endeavour to establish, is, that the work of Christ upon the cross is the sole meritorious source of the believer's justification through faith.

That which I consider as founded neither on scripture nor reason, is that which represents that, besides the removal of guilt through the death of Christ, it is necessary that his perfect obedience to the law should be imputed to the believer to constitute his righteousness and title to reward. This, I think, will be found substantially in the Homilies, in the writings of Harvey, Witherspoon, and Owen.

The mode I shall pursue to establish my view is to endeavour to prove the following propositions:

1. That innocence, or freedom from sin, is identical with righteousness.
2. That remission of sins is constantly in scripture (when ascribed to any thing as its meritorious source) ascribed to Christ's work upon the cross.
3. That righteousness and justification are expressly said, in the same divine book, to flow from the same work on the cross.
4. That the death of Christ has *satisfied* the law.

FIRST PROPOSITION.—That innocence, or freedom from sin, is identical with righteousness, is evident, I think, both from reason and from scripture.

1. Innocence means more or less, according to the nature of the standard of morality with which it is compared. In the language of the world, it includes no more than the absence of evil; because the world judges by a very low standard of virtue. Innocence, however, when it refers to the claims of any code of laws, generally implies something higher than the absence of actual crime; because even human laws enforce, generally speaking, duties to be performed. But this term, when employed with reference to the divine law, becomes very extended in meaning indeed—as extended as the commandment is broad. The law of God commands, not only to abstain from actual transgression, but

also to perform many duties. Not only are we required not to covet, nor steal, nor murder, but to love our neighbour as ourself, and the Lord our God with all our heart, and mind, and soul, and strength. The Scripture accordingly recognizes no character intermediate between one that does good and one that does harm. It pronounces no man free from guilt (except by imputation) who does not fulfil the duties cast upon him. The fruitless fig-tree is to be cut down. The servant, who hid his lord's talent in the earth, is to have his portion with the hypocrite. Though there is nothing of what is usually considered actual crime charged against him—only that he did no good—did not improve the talent entrusted to him, yet he is not only denied admittance into heaven, but thrust down into hell; and his sentence is recorded as an awful warning to the heedless and the idle: "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." To be innocent or free from guilt, therefore, with respect to the divine law, requires, not only that no prohibitions be transgressed, but that all prescribed duties be fulfilled. In short, according to the rules of reason and common sense, confirmed by the usual language of Scripture, innocence, or freedom from sin, is identical with righteousness.

Indeed, the distinction so often made between the *guilt* of commission and omission appears to me quite imaginary. Yet it is the ground upon which is usually argued the necessity for imputing the righteousness of Christ to the believer. But it is equally our duty to abstain from evil, as to do good works. It is as positive sin to refrain from "doing all good," as to transgress prohibitory precepts.

It follows as a necessary consequence, that *remission* of sins is tantamount to *imputation* of righteousness.

2. This identity seems to be directly implied in a few passages of Scripture to which I shall ask attention now. In Isaiah, liii. 11, we read, "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities." In this passage we have no mention of transferring the Redeemer's righteousness to his people. It is simply stated that by the circumstance of his *bearing their iniquities*, he was *to justify* as many as should attain to the knowledge of him. In the Acts, xiii. 38, 39, St. Paul declares to the Jews of Antioch, in Pisidia, "Be it known to you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." It will scarcely, I think, be denied that "the forgiveness of sins," in the first of these verses, is the same blessing spoken of in the second, under the phrase, "justified from all things." The last passage which I shall adduce under this head is that in Romans, iv. 6-8: "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are for-

given, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." The simple and literal understanding of these verses would impress a reader with the belief that the Apostle attached the same sense to "the forgiveness of iniquity" and "the covering of sins," that he did to "the imputation of righteousness without works." As the authority of Tiltonson on the subject would not, I fear, carry much weight in the present day, I shall omit it. But I shall quote the language of a modern divine, justly held in repute, in confirmation of the interpretation here put on these verses of St. Paul. In a volume of sermons, published by Wardlaw, the fourth treats on the doctrine of justification by faith. I have not the book at present, and can only quote from memory. He defines justification as denoting the treating of one as innocent and righteous, who is actually guilty. In this sense, he says, it is equivalent to pardon, forgiveness, remission of sins. He supports this definition from the passage I have been referring to last, in Rom. iv. 6-8, and infers, as I do above, that the *forgiveness of iniquities*, the *covering of sins*, and the *non-imputation of sin*, are expressions tantamount in meaning to the *imputation of righteousness without works*.*

3. It is worth observing in how many places the words justify, just, righteous, occur, confessedly expressive of nothing more than the *innocence* of the parties to which they respectively refer. In Deut. xxv. 1, "They shall justify the righteous, and condemn the wicked." Psal. li. 4, "That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and clear when thou judgest." Matt. xxvii. 19, "Have thou nothing to do with that just man." The passage before adduced from Acts xiii. 39, "By him are ye justified from all things," &c. In Rom. viii. 33, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." These two texts are clear instances of the undoubted use of the word justify in its doctrinal sense to convey merely *acquittal from charge*.

It is also remarkable that the Holy Spirit should have, in the original language of the New Testament, employed terms technically and properly meaning *acquittal from charge*, to express the *imputation of righteousness*, and the *righteousness imputed* to a believer. It affords, I think, a strong presumption that freedom from guilt, in reference to the divine law, amounts to being righteous. Dr. O'Brien, in his admirable Discourses on Faith,

* In the interpretation of the above passage of St. Paul, it appears to me that Dr. O'Brien has been betrayed into an indiscretion very rare with him, that of laying down a position on a controverted point, without adducing any thing in proof of it. High as his authority is, I cannot bow to his bare assertion upon a matter prominently and clearly stated in Scripture—prominently as its importance demanded, and so clearly, I conceive, that he who runs may read.

third sermon, has defined justification, in accordance with the uniform * sense of Scripture, to be 'a judicial declaration of the innocence of the person justified.' I have but one observation to add under this head, and that shall be in the words of the author just mentioned, but with a meaning very different indeed. 'That any doubt should be made of the general principle, *that the imputation of righteousness to the sinners whom God justifies, is as much a part of their justification as the remission of sins, has always appeared to me truly amazing.*'

SECOND PROPOSITION.—Remission of sins is uniformly ascribed, in the word of God, to the work of Christ upon the cross.

A twofold effect is attributed to the sacrifice of Christ, both of which were, with singular distinctness, prefigured in the two goats on the great day of atonement. That on which the high priest laid the iniquities of the people, and which was sent away into the wilderness, whilst it was intended to assure the people that their guilt was removed, did, in a beautiful manner, foreshow that Christ was to bear the iniquities of his people, to take away the sin of the world. The other goat typified Christ suffering the penalty of the broken law. I have heard it denied that it was part of Christ's work to bear the sins of his people, and that by at least one of evangelical views and character, under the notion, I suppose, that the believer's sins are to be covered by the robe of Christ's righteousness, and not to be taken away; a blessed privilege would thus be lost; the knowledge of our sin and all its guilt being altogether removed from us. But blessed be God for his mercy, and the revelation of it, by which we obtain, in the language of Dr. O'Brien, the entire recovery of the quiet confidence and inward peace of innocence. The justified believer is not forgiven only, not merely a pardoned criminal, but is redeemed from all iniquity by that blood which cleanseth from all sin. Such is the doctrine of the following

* Archbishop Whately, in his *Essay on Imputed Righteousness*, already referred to, has, page 209, censured the practice of commentators in first affixing a strict technical sense to each of the principal words employed in Scripture, and then interpreting the word, whenever it is found in the sacred writers, according to such precise definition. The archbishop has, I think, run into the other extreme in page 207 and elsewhere. In that page we find two texts of Scripture invested with a new meaning; Romans iv. 25, "Who was delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification." The view of the Priesthood of Christ, offered by R. D. in the *CHRISTIAN EXAMINER*, last year, affords an easy elucidation of this verse, without resorting to any unusual interpretation of terms. According to that well-supported view our justification was only effected when Christ having risen, ascended into heaven, and presented his blood on our behalf, as the high priest, under the Mosaic dispensation, went within the vail with blood.

In his grace's interpretation of 1 Cor. i. 30, he has assigned to one word a meaning plainly belonging to another word of the same text.

scriptures, "The Lord hath laid on him, or made to meet on him, the iniquities of us all." As if the prophet were describing the scape-goat, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many," &c. "Of his own self he bare our sins in his own on (*ἐν*) the tree;" "For we know he was manifested to take away our sins."

The second result of Christ's death, deliverance from the penalty of sin, need not be proved here.

But that this twofold effect emanates from the Redeemer's cross and passion alone, take the following places in proof. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes are we healed." "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," &c. "For this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." There are some who, while they admit that remission of sin is tantamount to imputation of righteousness, maintain that the blood of Christ, and such like expressions of Scripture include all his performances and obedience in life and death. But can there be a grosser instance than this of *petitio principii*? Is it not an assertion contradictory in terms, that Christ's death comprehends the works of his life? In the two last citations from Hebrews that apostle has, by contrasting the effects of his death, blood, &c. with those ascribed to the sacrifices and purifications of the Mosaic law, limited the whole work of redemption to the atonement of Christ upon the cross as the meritorious cause, with as much distinctness as if his object had been to exclude all his other works from any participation in effecting it. With St. John, then, I conclude, that "the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin." "Unto him, therefore, that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion for ever. Amen."

THIRD PROPOSITION.—That righteousness and justification are expressly declared in Holy Writ to come to the believer through Christ's work upon the cross alone.

The following passages are examples. Isaiah, liii. 11, "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities." Here justification is ascribed beforehand to the work of Christ in bearing the iniquities of the

many. Similar to this, and to the same purpose is the declaration of the apostle, 2 Cor. v. 21, "For he hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." This asserts that the end and effect of making Christ become sin for us, was that we might become the righteousness of God in him.* The doctrine here contended for may further be inferred from two passages of Revelations taken in conjunction; viz. vii. 13, 14, compared with xix. 8, "And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, what are these which are arrayed in white robes, and whence came they? And I said, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, these are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." "And to her (the Lamb's wife) was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white, for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints," τα δικαιώματα των αγίων. To these may be added, Rom. iii. 24, 25, "Being justified freely through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past;" and v. 9, of the same epistle, "Being now justified by his blood." Hence it is that it is said, "in the Lord have I righteousness," that Christ is called "the Lord our righteousness;" and that he is said to be "made unto us righteousness;" because by his death we obtain justification. He is the meritorious source, through faith in his blood, of our righteousness. There is one other passage which demands particular consideration here. It is that contained in Romans, v. 18, 19, "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." The translation in the margin of verse 18 is to be preferred to that in the text, for these reasons: it is the natural one, according to the order of the words in the original; and it relieves the apostle from the charge of tautology, inasmuch as it represents the subjects of his comparison in this verse to be distinct from those in the following. But to make the

* 'In him.' This phrase is employed in the word of God to convey two distinct figures. By one believers are viewed in Christ as their representative, and are considered to have died in him, are made righteous.—The second use of this phrase makes Christ the head, and believers the members of his body, the church. As the head guides, moves, and governs the members of the natural body, so does Christ, by his grace, work in his members both to will and to do. He does *for* them what they never were required to do, fits them for working, but does nothing, in their stead, which they were intended for, and expected to do, as the head performs not the office of the hands or the feet.

contrast in the 18th verse more complete, if for "the offence of one," in the first member, we substitute "one offence," the construction substituted for "the righteousness of one," in the latter clause of the verse should be, not "one righteousness," as in the margin, but one righteous act, *ενος δικαιοματος*.* This construction affects the interpretation of the next verse, which will appear thus, "For as by one man's disobedience (instanced in the one offence in verse 18) many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one (exhibited in the one act of righteousness) shall many be made righteous." This view is confirmed by the circumstance of an adjective corresponding to the word here translated "obedience," occurring in Phil. ii. 8, where the apostle speaks of Christ's voluntary death as the great instance of his obedience. I beg here to refer to Whately's Essay on the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul, 2d edition, pp. 200-5.

I am satisfied that all those passages of Scripture which we have considered under this head agree in one assertion, viz. that the justification of believers, and the righteousness imputed to them flow from the atonement made by Christ on the cross as the meritorious source, and from it alone.

FOURTH PROPOSITION.—The death of Christ has satisfied the law.

We have seen, if the foregoing reasoning be well-founded, that the death of Christ sufficed for the attainment of one leading purpose in the divine counsels, that of removing the believer's guilt, and procuring for him a title, through faith, to eternal life. There was, however, another important object to be effected, viz. the satisfaction of the law. This too, should have been secured before the believer's acceptance could be accomplished. Has this been done? I think it has. I admit God's law required fulfilment. But it did not leave itself without the means of redress in case it should be violated. Therefore, like other codes, it provided an alternative. Its language is, *do or die*. To Adam God said, "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Ever since his language is, "Do this and live." "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Unhappily "all have sinned." "There is none that doeth good." But all have died in Christ: "for we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead," or did all die, *απεθανον*. Not only has the guilt of commission, but that of omission been atoned for, as we are expressly told in Gal. iii. 10, and following verses, "It is written cursed is every one that continueth not in all things

* *δικαιοματος*. This word has two meanings at least, and it occurs in both in the 5th chap. of Romans. Its first meaning is, I believe, a just act; juste factum. The other is properly given to it in verse 16, where it is opposed to "condemnation;" viz. justification or acquittal. To express a course of righteousness imputed, this word is employed in the plural, Rev. xix. 8.

which are written in the book of the law to do them.—Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." When we speak of the *demands* of the law, we represent the matter in the light of a debt; a debt due of all men to their Creator; a debt incurred when we came from his hands endued with life and reason, and left unpaid through inability or dishonest reluctance. The penalty is exacted in consequence: and it is plain that, had the debt been paid *by* us, or *for* us, no penalty could have been justly inflicted—no atonement could have been demanded. The truth of this position can only be denied, I think, where it is forgotten that Christ and his people are one; or where it fails to be perceived that every law offers an alternative, viz. to obey or bear the sin.

Other topics connected with this important question occur, but I hasten to conclude, and remain

Your constant reader,

E. F. G.

P. S.—I may, perhaps, in a future letter, consider objections to the view here offered.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

IRELAND.

(From the Protestant Journal.)

EXTRAORDINARY RELIGIOUS PROCESSIONS IN MAYO.—The last *Gahoy Advertiser* contains a letter from a correspondent, descriptive of a very singular species of exhibition, which, if true, deserves to be better known to the British public, as one which they had hitherto to travel to other countries to obtain a sight of. If it be false, the superior publicity of your columns will admit of an efficacious contradiction. I, therefore, copy without commenting:—

"Sir—I was a few days ago in Ballina, and learned some things respecting the doings of Romanism there, which tend not a little to illustrate its aggressive, insatiable, and recklessly assuming spirit. About twelve months ago, Dr. Machale introduced a practice, in conducting the funerals of devotees, which shows a determination on his part, to graft as rapidly as possible, on the Popery of this country, all the open insulting idolatry of the Spanish peninsula. A magnificent pall is spread over the coffin, decorated with such insignia as all believe to be connected in some way with the security of salvation. Twelve persons, arrayed in what are called state scapulars, walk in a processional way before the body, singing or chanting a hymn in praise of the Virgin. A figure as large as life, designed to represent our Blessed Lord, is carried along, as an object of worship, or of religious veneration. In the hands of this are placed two large lit candles, usually encased, if the weather be wet or gusty, with a peculiar sort of lantern.

Thus appointed, the funeral procession moves along the public streets, often performing such circuitous routes as to march through the whole town, and during its entire progress it is conducted as a solemn pompous religious ceremony. Industrious efforts are made to throw around it all the peculiar sort of atmosphere which

invests the procession of the Host on the Continent. No pains are spared to draw all eyes on it, and produce a suspension of secular business while it passes. The priests, and especially Dr. Machale, speak of it with affected reverence, and inculcate its being regarded in this light, as the sacred observance of divine worship. Not a doubt exists on the minds of any with whom I have conversed of its being designed as a preliminary to the introduction of the procession and public adoration of the Host. So extremely glaring is the practice, and so akin to the degrading street exhibitions of Spain, that many of the better sort of Romanists feel heartily ashamed of it, and openly condemn it. The Protestants (and well they may) feel bitterly insulted.

Simply because the late proprietor of the *Ballina Impartial* printed some trifling remark on it, leniently expressive of disapprobation, Dr. M—— publicly cursed him from the altar, and held him up before the people as the likely subject of a special judgment from God. The man carried in him, at the time, the seeds of an incurable malady, and, as he died within three weeks afterwards, the whole of the Romanists (with the exception of a few educated people) are fully convinced of his having been blighted by the bishop's curse, and cut down by the doom of the Almighty for the sacrilegious crime of remarking on the funerals!"

ANOTHER BIBLE BURNT!—The Parish Priest of Ballinasloe, in the diocese of Clonfert, lately attended a man named Patrick Lyons in his dying moments. A few hours previously to Lyons' death he was visited by this Priest, who, upon his quitting the death-bed of the poor man, found an Irish Bible on the dresser in the kitchen, which he took, and, having opened the fire with a pair of tongs, deliberately laid the volume of eternal truth upon the blazing coals, and walked out of the house

without saying a word! Immediately the sick man's son, who witnessed what had been done, ran into the room, exclaiming, "O daddy, daddy, Father Dillon threw my Bible into the fire; come and take it out, if you can." But the poor weak man was unable to move himself from where he lay. At length a woman, named Molly Kelly, or Carter, came in and took what remained of the cover of the Bible out of the flames!—*Correspondent of the Evening Packet.*

THE LYING WONDERS OF POPERY—A
MAN RAISED FROM THE DEAD.

To the Editor of the Protestant Journal.

Galway, Ireland.

SIR—I have just heard of an occurrence which, though far from being singular, or even remarkable in this unhappy country, some of your readers may think worthy of notice. Some three or four weeks ago, a man of a strange and sinister appearance, traversed a considerable part of this and the adjoining county, in the character of a *pilgrim*; and, owing to a tale of amazement and supernatural wonder he told respecting his having died and being raised from the dead, was generally received as a superior being, and as a kind of special and extraordinary messenger from God. He was a tall man, of a haggard countenance, and wore a remarkably white shirt, in some degree resembling a shroud, frilled and plaited in front; and as he specially professed to be the messenger and apostle of *Mary*, or of "our blessed Lady of Mount Carmel," he was habited in a white fustian jacket, and trowsers of dark brown cloth, and wore on his fingers a number of broad rings of either gold or brass. Every thing in his dress and outward appearance was made to convey as much as possible the idea of one who had risen from the dead to proclaim the virtues of "*the holy Scapular*." The story he every where told respecting himself, was to the following effect:—

"He was the son of a Protestant clergyman in Leinster. Some time ago he fell sick and died, and was carried before the judgment-seat of

N. S. VOL. III.

God, where he heard the sentence pronounced upon him of everlasting banishment to hell. Just as he was about to be dragged away to his doom, the Virgin Mary, whom he saw sitting at the right hand of the divine throne, rose up to plead for him, on account of his having for a short time 'worn her livery,' his nurse having, during his illness, and while he was in a state of insensibility, placed 'the blessed Scapular' around his neck. Immediately upon the Virgin's interceding for him, he was released from condemnation, granted a renewal of life for the term of seven years, and solemnly enjoined to go about during the whole period of his respite existence without shoes, stockings or hat, living upon alms, sleeping but one night under the same roof, teaching everywhere the certainty of salvation through the Virgin Mary, and the wearing of her 'livery;' and especially warning all who would be saved, against hearing heretical ministers or coming in contact with '*the Leabhar Dhu*'—the black book, or Bible—or with any of the books given away to read by Protestants. But before being sent back to the earth, he was commanded to take a look into hell, that he might witness and be qualified to declare the fate awaiting all who do not worship the 'Mother of God;' and upon his eyes being affected in an extraordinary way, he was suddenly enabled to see into and overlook the regions of the damned, which were removed but three steps from heaven. Here he saw many hundreds of Protestants whom he had known in life, and among others, a brother of his own, who had been a minister of the Established Church. There were a few Romanists among them, but these were only such as had neglected the honour due to the Virgin, or failed to make due confession to their priests; but among the whole multitude there was not a single Roman Catholic priest, though all the Protestant clergymen seemed to be there who had ever lived, the numbers being so great that no one could count them."

Most of your English readers may suppose, Mr. Editor, that so mon-

3 c

strous an imposition, a fable so outrageously and appallingly absurd, could not for a moment have been listened to by even the most unlettered peasant, or that it could have been otherwise received by every class of the population, than with feelings of unmingled indignation and disgust. But, alas! Sir, they know little, from what they see of the modest face of the system in Great Britain, how hideously Popery disfigures the human intellect, and how awfully it throws a withering idiotcy over all its powers, when, in a country like this, it holds almost the entire population in its chains, and drags them, like so many unresisting slaves, at the wheels of its æpulchral and Moloch-enthroned car. The impostor was, with scarcely an exception, received by the Roman Catholic people with respect and veneration. The mean and illiterate heard and believed his monstrously supernatural tale, with gaping wonder and solemn awe; and of those who claim and are conceded a character for *respectability* and *intelligence*, many heard him with respectful credence, received him into their houses as a specially holy man, and did every thing in their personal treatment of him to give truth, importance, and solemnity to his imposture in the eyes of the vulgar; while, so far as I have been able to learn, not a man of them expressed, at least in public, a doubt as to his pretensions, or treated them with any thing approaching the repudiation and disgust which they deserved. Persons possessing the feelings and information of *gentlemen* harboured him in their houses, and directly lent their countenance to his story; and the entire body of the people looked up to him with a higher degree of religious feeling than they often manifest to the pictures and crucifixes which their church has made the objects of their spiritual worship.

However we view this man, whether as a miserable fugitive skulking from the punishment of crime, or as one of the numerous body of *pilgrims* and *votaries* who infest this country, and trade on the credulity and superstitions of the people, or as a secret emissary of the priests, expressly dis-

ciplined and employed to diffuse through the popular mind the *virus* of Popish delusion, and a malignant antipathy to Protestantism and the Bible, the manner in which he was received by all classes of Romanists, and the all but universal credit which was yielded to his pretensions, furnish a most appalling illustration of the profound debasement into which Romanism plunges the human mind; of the fearful avidity with which its people turn from the living God to cunningly and even clumsily devised fables, and of the dreadful truth of its "coming," its spirit, and all its doings, being "after the working of Satan, with all power and signs, and *lying wonders*, and with all *deceivableness of unrighteousness* in them that perish, because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." Oh! who, Sir, that has even one grain of Christian or humane feeling for precious, immortal, perishing souls, can look at a state of things so poignantly heart-piercing, without earnestly praying to God night and day, and zealously aiding by his substance in the propagation of divine truth, for "the destruction of the wicked one, with the Spirit of Christ's mouth, and by the brightness of his coming," and of his manifestation by the Gospel?

My own impression—and I speak from an intimate knowledge both of the system of monkery and of its recent doings in this country—is, that the impostor was the secretly accredited agent of some *Carmelite Friars*; and I greatly mistake if I could not lay my hands upon the man who manufactured his tale, and particularly commissioned him. The Carmelites have of late been making extraordinary efforts to multiply the confraternities of the *Scapular*; and "holy frauds" are both the very essence of their devoteism, and the grand, and even only means by which it is propagated. Their success has been mournfully great. Would to God that exertions, even a tenth part so zealous and extensive, were being made for the dissemination of "the truth as it is in Jesus!"

I am, Sir, your obt. servant,

VERITAS.

DEATH OF DR. SCHLEIERMACHER, OF
BERLIN.

On the 12th of February died the Rev. Frederick Daniel Ernest Schleiermacher, D.D. Minister of Trinity Church, and one of the professors of theology in the university of Berlin, in his sixty-sixth year; a man whose name stands at the summit of distinction among the moral philosophers, scholars, and divines of modern Germany. He was a native of Silesia, and was educated in the seminaries of the United Brethren, at Niesky, and afterwards at Barby. In 1787, being in his twentieth year, he became a student in the University of Halle; where he enjoyed the great advantages of attending on the lectures of Fred. Aug. Wolf, the celebrated author of the *Prolegomena* upon Homer, and whom his countrymen generally regarded as the greatest philologist of his age; of John Aug. Eberhard, the Professor of Philosophy, author of the "New Apology for Socrates," and who, though a clergyman and a preacher, was a favourite of Frederick II. and the intimate friend of Nicolai and Mendelsohn, and well known to be a participant in their infidelity; and, in theology, of Nüsselt, a man of attractive character and profound learning, the author of many works in different departments of theology, some of which (particularly on the Evidence of Revelation, numerous Exegetical Dissertations, and prædentic treatises for the direction of divinity students,) are of considerable utility, but the general bearing of his theology was towards the assumingly called liberal and rational system; and Knapp, that admirable scholar, pious Christian, and able professor, whose sun shone brighter and brighter in his latter years. The young Schleiermacher's time at Halle was the very period when the seeds of Antisupra-naturalism, which had been long scattered by different hands, were vigorously germinating. To the impressions of his university education, may be, in great part, imputed the astonishing phenomenon which his subsequent character ex-

hibited; a compound of Moravian piety and simplicity, with the most knotted entanglements of sceptical metaphysics, and the unbridled speculations of an ever-restless Neologism. This strange combination may have acquired and maintained its existence, from the extraordinary qualities of Schleiermacher's mind; which led him into fine-spun refinements of analysis, and an almost incredible depth of meditative penetration, such as brought, in his mind the most discordant elements into apparent agreement. In 1794 he commenced the work of preaching: and so engaging, yet dignified and impressive, was his manner, and so agreeable to a polite and philosophical audience was the matter of his sermons (if sermons they could be called), that he became popular in Berlin at a time when religion and public worship were almost universally scorned. One may conjecture what was the character of his own preaching, or at least what was his taste, from his having, in this early part of his course, translated and published the sermons of the admired London Unitarian, Mr. Fawcett. He published several volumes of his own Discourses; concerning which, we are informed by good judges, that the elegant and logical frigidity of the earlier volumes gave way, in the latter, to more of evangelical doctrine and Christian affection. At this time he engaged with Frederick von Schlegel (who and his brother Aug. William were the wondrous pair in philology, criticism, poetry, and all elegant science, whom all Germany admired as her new *Dioscuri*;) in an intended German translation of all the extant works of Plato. For such an undertaking Schleiermacher was well fitted, not merely by his Greek learning and his accurate study of the great philosopher of Athens, but by a singular congeniality of mind. The spirit of Plato seemed to live again in the young Berlin preacher. Schlegel, drawn aside by other literary labours, relinquished his projected part, and left his friend to occupy the entire field. Several volumes of this trans-

lation have been in succession published; but we believe that the whole design has not been accomplished, and we most regret that (so far as we know) a Dissertation, which was to have crowned the work, on the Characteristics of Plato and of his Philosophy, is left an unsupplied desideratum. Schleiermacher's papers on the Grecian philosophy, published in the memoirs of the Royal Academy of Sciences (of which he was secretary for the department of philosophy,) contain lucid proofs of his qualifications in this respect.

When the present King of Prussia constituted, in so admirable a manner for the interests of both learning and religion, the University of Berlin, in 1810, he was appointed one of the Professors in Ordinary of Theology. His lectures drew great attention, and were admired for their comprehension, their originality, and profoundness, and the interesting manner in which he orally explained the most abstruse propositions. He seemed to stand on the intermediate ground between the Rationalists and the Supernaturalists; but on what point of the line was not easy to ascertain—perhaps it was a varying point. Within the last few years, he has openly declared that he was not a Rationalist. It is very probable that evangelical feelings became more powerful in his heart, by a participation of the remarkable revival of religion which took place in Berlin, and some other parts of Prussia, about 1814. He was an occasional hearer of the plain and humble preacher to the poor, Hermes; whose ministry was so remarkably blest to many of the rich and great who, at the period which we have referred to, resorted to the obscure Almshouse Chapel, in which that servant of Christ taught the righteousness which is by faith. Schleiermacher gave the weight of his character and commendation to the good old man's preaching; and he delivered the oration on his death, in 1817.

Of his exegetical and theological works, the unfinished "Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke" (1817)

is the most known in this country; in consequence of the translation of it and a large original Introduction, by the Rev. Connop Thirlwall, of the University of Cambridge, published in 1825. It is certainly a work of surprising ingenuity; and one cannot but admire the acuteness, the searching power, and the unexpected deductions of the author: but one of the best uses that we can make of it is, in the spirit of Socrates, after surveying an array of fine gewgaws, "How well we can do without these things!" Mr. Thirlwall says of Schleiermacher, "It has been the fate of this extraordinary writer, to open a new path in every field of literature he has entered, and to tread it all alone. This work deserves to be studied as a specimen of exegetical criticism which has seldom been equalled, and which cannot fail to excite the admiration even of those who do not admit all its conclusions." p. clii. An English journal says, concerning that Essay, "that there are many paragraphs, and some in which the *essence* of the sentiment is not objectionable, disfigured with a hastiness of assertion, and an irreverent flippancy of manner and insinuation, which ill become a minister of the gospel, or any Christian, or any man of ordinary good sense. Amidst the mass of intricate, ingenious, bold, startling, and sometimes almost profane speculations, which fill the larger part of these pages, we find some valuable observations and hints of interpretation, which deserve to be found in better company."—*Eclectic Review*, May, 1829, p. 425.

Of his "Brief Outlines of Theological Study," (*Kurze Darstellung u. s. w.* 1811,) the learned and excellent Professor Pusey, of Oxford, says,—"A work which, with a few great defects, is full of important principles and comprehensive views, and which will form a new era in theology whenever the principles which it furnishes, for the cultivation of the several theological sciences, shall be acted upon:" and he describes the author as "that great man who, whatever be the errors of his system, has done more than any other (some

very few perhaps excepted), to the restoration of religious belief in Germany."—*Pusey on the Theology of Germany*, vol. i. p. 115.

His principal theological work is "The Christian Faith, presented in its Connexion; according to the Fundamental Principles of the Evangelical [i. e. Lutheran] Church : " (*Der Christliche Glaube, u. s. w.*) in two volumes, 1822, and a second enlarged edition in 1830. This Body of Divinity, after an Introduction of very valuable matter, including much of the author's characteristic originality, proceeds to develop the essence and harmony of religious truth, setting out from the consciousness which the human mind possesses of the necessity of pious feeling. From this point of departure he proceeds to Creation and Created Intelligent Beings: then, the Attributes of God which relate to the Dependent Universe: the original Perfection of the world, and of man: the opposite of pious feeling, Sin, original, and actual: the State of the World in relation to Sin: the Attributes of God in relation to Sin: Holiness and Justice: Divine Mercy: Disclosure of a Method of Divine Grace: Redemption and the Redeemer; his Person and Work: Participation of Moral Perfection and Blessedness with the Redeemer: Regeneration: Sanctification: the State of the World in relation to Redemption: the Origination of the Church: Election: the Impartation of the Holy Spirit: the Relation of the Church to the World: the essential and unalterable Characteristics of the Church: the Holy Scripture: the Ministry of the Word: Baptism; the Lord's Supper: the Power of the Keys: Prayer in the Name of Jesus: the Changeable Condition of the Church, in the present state: the Plurality of Visible Churches, and the Unity of the Invisible: the Fallibility of the Visible Church, and the Infallibility of the Invisible: the Ultimate Perfection of the Church; the Second Coming of Christ; the Resurrection of the Body; the Last Judgment; Eternal Blessedness: the Divine Perfections which relate to Re-

demption; Love; Wisdom. 'The Trinity.

We have thus given the outline of the strange plan of this extraordinary work: but we cannot attempt to convey an idea of its execution. A fine connexion of thought passes through the whole, and joins each part to the preceding. With respect to the decrees of God, he deserts the Lutheran and adopts the Calvinistic views. Many passages are most impressive and convincing. Others seem to be covered with thick metaphysical darkness. While he keeps to the Bible, he is clear, tender, and very profitable; but, after a portion of this good description, he darts off, with an eagle's (shall we say, a demon's?) flight, into the regions of metaphysical possibilities, doubts, conjectures, and arguments in which the conclusion seems infinitely remote from the grounds on which the premises are assumed. To understand him, and to keep up the recollection of antecedent parts, while travelling across this desert covered with its clouds of sands, requires a closer attention and a more patient labour than most persons would be disposed to give, through the difficult medium of a foreign language in that involved style which the late German dialecticians have adopted. His work has already found commentators, and probably will find more. An able writer in the *Archives du Christianisme* says of him, that he had the mind of a sceptic with the heart of a believer.

In September, 1828, he was brought to London, to preach on the re-opening of Dr. Steinkopf's Church. On that occasion, his extemporary prayer was peculiarly solemn, humble, and affecting. His sermon was from Eph. iv. 3. Supposing (which he unhappily seemed to assume) that all the hearers had been really converted persons, it was an excellent sermon, full of tenderness, spirituality, andunction. It was delivered without any written preparation; but several gentlemen took notes, and from their united labour the discourse was printed, a small part only having been revised by the preacher, on ac-

count of his so speedily returning to Berlin. A translated specimen of it, which conveys a tolerably correct idea of its character, is in the article of the *Eclectic Review* already referred to.

In his personal intercourse, Dr. Schleiermacher was a man of most kind, bland, open, and communicative manners. To the young persons who resorted to him for private religious instruction, he would speak with flowing tears upon the most weighty truths of religion, especially the love and grace of Christ. He delighted to open his immense stores of knowledge, on every subject, to intelligent and serious inquirers, whether students or others.

If any thoroughly qualified person were to write a life of Schleiermacher, detailing his career as a scholar, a patriot, a philosopher, a professor, a minister, and a Christian, describing his methods of study, and unfolding his mental principles as well as detailing his outward activity, it would be a signal benefit to the world. It would contain treasures of information, lessons of caution, and suggestions of direction and encouragement, which to students of human nature, and persons intent on self-improvement, would be invaluable.

We lament that we have not a larger stock of materials for our account of this great man: but we trust that the want will be ere long supplied. We are informed that the closing scenes of his life were replete with instruction and edification to those around him. On his dying bed he administered the Lord's Supper, to his sorrowing yet rejoicing friends. Nearly his last words were, "I have found my salvation in the blood of my Redeemer, and to that I hold fast."

His death was felt with deep sympathy of grief by the University and the City of Berlin. It was computed that more than thirty thousand spectators attended his funeral.

Thus, a lesson of prime importance is presented to our young men. Here they see a man of the first-rate natural talents and of stupendous

acquirements; a phoenix in ancient and modern literature, a philosopher in the highest rank, who had drunk the fullest draughts of the boasted systems of Psychology and Logic which his countrymen have in succession idolized,—those of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel;—than whom no man was better qualified to estimate their claims; a man who had yielded to them too much of his heart; one of the most searching, speculative, and profound of the famous modern theologians of Germany; who, during a large part of his life, had been associated with some of the ablest Neologists;—they see such a man sitting at the feet of his Saviour, and "counting all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord." May this lesson of truth and wisdom not be given in vain!

PROTESTANT SCHOOLS IN FRANCE.

THE number of schools in France, intended to receive exclusively the children belonging to Protestant communions, may be estimated at nine hundred. Of this number about three hundred and eighty are under the jurisdiction of the Academy of Strasbourg; one hundred and seventy are under the cognizance of the Academy of Besançon; fifty are under that of the Academy of Toulouse; the rest are divided among the other regions of France.

They are almost all in a state of progress. It may be said that before the late law relating to elementary instruction, they were in a state to receive the impulse which that law gave them.

A glance at the principles of these schools will enable us to judge of their importance, and of the spirit which animates them: we will commence at Bourdeaux, and finish at Paris.

There exists at Bourdeaux one of the most beautiful Protestant schools in the kingdom. It contains three hundred scholars, and is directed by a very distinguished master, M. Reclus, who, before the formation of a normal or model school in this town, had

formed, and is still forming, a great number of elementary institutions. M. Reclus has founded, in the department of Gironde and the neighbouring departments, upwards of seventy-five schools for mutual instruction. His influence failed at the normal school of Bourdeaux, to which it was desired that he might be engaged as Professor of the system.

Protestant schools, less important, but all well directed, exist at Tonniers, at Clérac, and above all, at Nérac.

At Sainte-Foy, M. Bourgade has again joined to a large elementary school, a superior institution, which furnishes masters, and exercises great influence over the surrounding country.

Montauban possesses a series of Protestant elementary institutions, some asylums, a boys' school, directed by M. Anquetil, who has sent out many masters, and whose school has long been the normal school of the country. He has attached to it an evening school for adults. The institution of the Minister, M. Moline, founded by the Protestant families of the south, forms, between this excellent elementary school and the school of theology, a sort of transition and intermediate school. Its founders, attaching to it great importance, continue to make considerable sacrifices in its favour. Montauban possesses an excellent girls' school. There are Protestant schools at Négrepelisse, Réalville, &c.

Eighty young Protestants receive, in the celebrated institution of Soréze, where they have a distinguished minister of their own communion, elementary, intermediate, and secondary education and instruction.

At Castres, M. Rolland, a master of the greatest merit, and inventor of a method of writing, and a method of reading, continues to superintend, with success, a considerable school.

At Toulouse, the Protestant children attend the beautiful school of the Capitol, of which one of the ministers of this city is special inspector, and which owes a great part of its prosperity to the zeal which he employs in the discharge of his duties.

In the department of the Gard, there are not only a great number of Protestant schools, but latterly it has been known to attach to them some of those Sunday-schools which in England and in the United States produce such useful results.

In the department of Drôme, the minister, M. Brun, has formed, at Dieulefit, an elementary school, and a school intended for the education of masters.

The excellent Protestant schools in the department of the Doubs, to which the ancient committee of Audincourt, the model of the local committees, has communicated so fine a movement, continue to prosper.

The Committee of Audincourt has succeeded in superseding throughout the method of individual instruction by simultaneous instruction, or mutual instruction. The seventeen schools of the seventeen communes, which compose the consistory, have at this time about fifteen hundred scholars.

It is the same with the Protestant schools of the Upper and Lower Rhine. The town of Mulhouse has obtained an elementary and intermediate instruction so complete that one knows not what is left to be desired. The schools are public, but the Protestant population here forms the majority.

The industrious towns of St. Mary, and those of Colmar and Munster, tread in the steps of Mulhouse.

At Strasburg, the school of Temple-Neuf, the director of which has been called before the committee of the district, continues to hold the first rank among those which are the most prosperous.

To the ancient committees of Wolfisheims, Bouxwiller, and Niederbrun, we are under great obligations for the numerous and well-attended schools of the principal places in these cantons.

The school at Soue, a section of Rochfort, continues, notwithstanding the poverty of the people.

Satisfactory information has also been received respecting the state of instruction at Lezay, in the department of the Deux Sèvres.

At Niort, there are ten Protestant schools.

Rouen reckons four Protestant schools. We cannot pass over the progress of elementary instruction of a small commune in the department of the Lozère. St. Germain de Calberte, notwithstanding the obstacles which oppose, such as the poverty of the people, and the nature of the country, is not without success. The country is mountainous, wild, and intersected with rivers and torrents. Notwithstanding all these difficulties, about six hundred children frequent, during the winter, the schools of this church, which are under the care of masters or mistresses.

In that of Orpierre, department of the Upper Alps, and in that of Mens, department of the Isère, schools are kept up to the number of thirty; and contain about 700 scholars.

The Protestant schools in Paris are ten in number. They continue generally to be conducted in a manner very satisfactory.

One grand difficulty which the Protestant schools in France have to encounter, the elementary schools with the others, is the want of good masters. In the greater part of the

normal schools, the means of their religious instruction fail. Measures are certainly continually taken with respect to this by the Minister of Public Instruction.

It is above all to be desired, not only that the establishments existing in Strasbourg, Nîmes, Dieulefit, and Châtillonsur-Loire, intended especially for the formation of Protestant masters, should experience an extension, but that others might be formed at Bourdeaux and in the north, for the Protestant schools of that part of the kingdom.—*Le Moniteur Universel*.

DISCUSSION BETWEEN THE REVEREND
MESSRS. BAGOT AND PORTER, BELFAST.

SYNOD OF ULSTER.

*“Resolved unanimously—*That the thanks of this body be transmitted to the Rev. Daniel Bagot, of Newry, for the ability and zeal with which he defended the grand and essential doctrine of the Gospel—the proper Deity of the Son of God—in a late polemical discussion; and at the same time, we bless God for the success that attended Mr. Bagot’s exertions.”

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
AND
Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXXV. SEPTEMBER, 1834. Vol. III.

A SERMON.

Now faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen.—HEB. xi. 1.

I AM confident that any person, who would fairly, and candidly, bring his mind to the subject; could not fail to perceive, that there is an extraordinary inconsistency, between the professed belief, and the general practice of Christians; an inconsistency so extreme, as to be utterly unaccountable, on any common principle. If men rejected the Scriptures, and led a sinful, or a worldly life, however wrong that state might be, it would be nevertheless accountable, and of a piece. But for men to receive a revelation, as coming from the great God, and to treat that with practical inattention, is what no one could believe possible, if facts did not irrefragably prove it.

I am anxious to direct your attention to this point. For I am convinced that seeing this matter as it is, might, in some instances, open new light to the mind; might lead it to suspect, at least, that there may be something of dangerous delusion, in its state; when it is capable, on the most momentous of all subjects, of contradictions, and absurdities, which in lesser concerns would be pronounced, as nothing short of madness. A few instances will, however, show, that all who are not decided infidels, acknowledge things in religion as true, which seem, in their own nature calculated to produce the most powerful effects on the human mind, but which, notwithstanding, exhibit none of those practical results, so reasonably to be expected.

All around us, for example, believe in God, and in his omnipresence. They believe, in a word, that that awful Being, that supreme Majesty, that dread Sovereign, before whom the powers of heaven bow down in lowly reverence—that he is continually

before us, observing every secret action we perform, and reading every thought that rises in our hearts. Now, does not this one sublime simple truth, seem of itself sufficient to fill every capacity of the soul—to captivate every thought—to shame down all impurity—and to convert all that is within us, into “holiness to the Lord?” But does it do so? On the contrary, is it not notorious that the presence of any great man, nay, of any common acquaintance, is, by the majority of Christians, more sensibly felt, than the presence of God? Who, before an earthly prince would not take good care, to drop no expression, unnecessarily at least, which would make him frown? Who would use his name in any manner against the rules of established courtesy? And yet how often is God’s name profaned, against his positive command, and avowedly before his face? Who is there (but a decidedly religious man) who would not be a thousand times more distressed, if a friend stepped up to him and said, “Do you know that without intending it, you affronted such, or such a great man,” than if he were to say, “you have thoughtlessly taken God’s name in vain, which you know to be a disrespect, and insult to the Divine Majesty?” Now, in all this, there would be nothing to wonder at, if you were thus boldly answered: “Why, I know beyond all doubt, that this great man exists, and might injure, or discountenance me in society; but the being of a God I do doubt, or at all events, that he is the author of that Scripture which says, thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God, in vain.” But the wonder is, that the man who thus bows down to a fellow-mortal, and carelessly affronts the Almighty, will tell you, that he is as sure of God’s existence, and of the truth of Scripture, and that God is present with him, and has power to save, or to destroy him, as he is that he himself is a living, and sentient being.

Again—every one you meet with professes to believe, in the immortality of his own soul; and that its endless condition will be one, either of the purest happiness, or of the most insufferable misery—that in heaven there will be no more death, nor pain, nor crying—that eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, or imagination conceived the delights, and blessedness of that happy place—that, on the other hand, hell is an accursed banishment from God, and light, and tranquillity, and hope, “where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” This is, you all know, a part of the admitted creed, in all Christian countries. In heaven, or in hell, thus understood, every man will freely grant you that he himself must shortly be. Let him have to calculate the probable length of his life, as a matter of business, and you will find what he thinks of it. He wants, suppose, to obtain an annuity for his life, and will gravely talk of six, seven, or eight years’ purchase. Here, then, you have his own calculation of the space of time in which, in all fair probability, he will be in endless happiness, or endless torments: always allowing that even that space is uncertain, and that this night his soul may be

required of him. Now considering with what lively feeling, and real dismay, such a man would contemplate the loss of any part of his property, or of even the most insignificant member of his body, what shall we say to the strange insensibility, and stupid unconcern, with which the same person will risk the loss, and ruin, of his immortal soul?

But farther. What powerful emotions, in another way, and of a higher kind, does the universally admitted fact, that Christ died upon the cross to save sinners, seem, in its nature, calculated to produce? Try men's hearts; and you will not find that they are generally dead to gratitude. Make for them some noble, generous, disinterested sacrifice; and you will find that, in human matters, the heart of man is true to the touch of kindness, and to the calls of friendship; that it can feel an obligation to the quick; that it can glow and kindle at the name of benefactor. What, then, are God's claims, his admitted claims, to all these softer affections of the soul? What other friend has laid down his life for us? What other benefactor has delivered up his dear, and only son, for us? "Herein is love," "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Upon that blessed Being—upon that pure, and sinless Lamb—was laid the shame, and confusion, the guilt, and punishment, of all our loathsome impurities, and accursed wickednesses. Hour after hour did that object of God's eternal love, present himself in agonies, before the eyes of his Father, and offer himself as a spotless victim to pay with his own sufferings, and tears, and blood, the price of our redemption. But I need not repeat this dismal tragedy. You know it all. But account for it, if you can, why all favours are valued more than God's favours; why these things are ~~just acknowledged~~ in theory, but not felt in practice; why God's unexampled and infinite proofs of love, do not warm, or soften, or penetrate men's hearts; why those mysterious agonies, at which the sun was darkened; the rocks were rent; the earth did quake, and the graves delivered up their dead;—why these can act with the energy of omnipotence, on every thing, but the souls for which those agonies were borne, and suffered.

For all these miracles of ingratitude there is but one way of accounting. Man, in his natural state, is dead to spiritual, and eternal things. That principle, or faculty, which recognizes, and apprehends God, and the things of God, so as to make them operative, and influential, on the mind, and heart—that principle, I say, died in man at the fall; and is in action, only where the Spirit of Christ has quickened the soul into the likeness of his resurrection. It is thus that the men of the world, surrounded as they are, at every moment, by the awful realities of eternity, feel no suitable impressions. God is around them, and within them. Heaven, and hell, are straight before them. They grant it all. But the conviction slips from them. It has no power, no interest, no vitality. Let them hear that some fellow-man has

suffered in their cause—their heart answers to the call, and real, living gratitude springs up. Tell them that Christ, their acknowledged Lord, and Saviour, has died for them a death of unexampled pain—and they admit the obligation—but it has nothing of real life about it—it does not reach the heart.

These men want the faculty by which religious truths are apprehended: and unless a thing is apprehended by its appropriate faculty it cannot suitably affect us. If we see and handle a fine fruit, we may be pleased with its shape, its colour, and its smell. But unless we taste it, we have no notion of the real, peculiar, and distinctive excellence of the thing. A deaf man may behold a grand display of orchestral arrangements, and musical performers, and think it an imposing sight. But the thing intended by all this—the end of all this apparatus—the melodious enchantment—the harmonious sound, is still a stranger to his soul. Here then is the secret of that otherwise inexplicable riddle, that man, rational, immortal man, should value time above eternity, his body above his soul, the slightest favour from a fellow-creature, above all the mercies, and benefits which God can pour upon him. For the one class of objects all men have the appropriate, and discerning sense: and for the other, most men have not that sense. Human, and temporal things are apprehended, and taken in, by the ordinary exercise of our natural faculties. And finding in all men those natural faculties, they do not fail to make their suitable impressions. Eternal and divine things are, on the other hand, addressed to a faculty above nature, a principle dead, or dormant, in the great mass of mankind, and consequently fall pointless, and powerless upon the mind; are like sounds to the deaf, or light and colours to the blind.

The principle, then, which brings man fairly within the reach of religious influences, which gives eternal things their due weight, in his practical estimation, which gives them the point, and life of waking certainties, and actual existencies—is faith. "Faith," says my text, "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen:" the confident expectation of the one; the clear, heartfelt and realizing conviction of the other. Faith is to the truths of Scripture, what the sun is to the face of nature. A stranger who passes through a fine country by night, may be told, and place full confidence in the information, of all the beauties with which he is encircled. But let the day arise, and open to his view, smiling valleys, and resplendent rivers, the cattle feeding in their pastures, light, and shade scattered upon the hills, woods, and villages, and glittering spires—then he does not merely hear from others—he knows, and sees, and feels for himself, the paradise which lies around him. So it is with the truths of Scripture. The man who has not faith, may, in a certain sense, see and hear, and give them his assent. But still the veil is upon his mind. There is a secret virtue in the Scripture—a life, and spirit in God's word, which he does not comprehend. For this, its spiritual meaning, he has

eyes that see not, ears that hear not, and a heart that will not understand. But let faith once cast the beam out of his eye—let the day-star from above arise—let him who caused the light to shine out of darkness, shine in his heart, and those truths which fell like blunted arrows from his soul, are now quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword. They are not new truths: but they are seen by him with new eyes. They brighten into new light; and seem, as if by enchantment, transfigured into new existence. He believed before like one asleep, that there is a God. But now that blessed truth bursts like new day upon his soul; and seems to fill all nature round him, and all his soul within him, with an all-sustaining, all-cheering, ever-present God. He believed before, if indeed belief it could be called, in the immortality of his own soul. But he now feels a deathless principle within his breast. He feels congenialized to the eternal world. He feels the quickenings of a spiritual nature, and the throbs of immortality. He is assured that the life he now lives will know no end; that it is the morning of a never-ending day; that it is none other than the gate of heaven. He believed before, but without a heart, that Christ had shed his precious blood for him. But he now can trust him with his whole salvation. His soul magnifies the Lord; and his spirit rejoices in God his Saviour. On that altar where the atonement for his sins was made, he swears uncompromising allegiance, and devoted love. On that cross where his Lord, and Master bled, and died for him, all his earthly affections, and desires are crucified. He parts with, and casts for ever from him, the allurements, the vanities, the interests, and the friendship, of a vain, an unhappy, a perishing, and an ungrateful world.

Of the practical effects of a realizing faith this eleventh chapter to the Hebrews affords abundant instances. It was by the active power of this principle that "Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark, to the saving of his house." Others were warned as well as he. The same deluge, was threatened to all. But in Noah's case alone, the revelation was mixed with faith, in him that heard it. Planting and building, eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, the bustle, the variety, the nearness, and the distinctness of present objects, effaced from that devoted generation all thought, or recollection of the impending ruin. But into Noah's mind the impression entered deeply. The evidence of things not seen as yet, was clear to his soul, as the daylight to his eyes. The horrors of the deluge—the vengeance of the Almighty—these were present to his mind in all the terrors of real life, and certainty. He was moved with fear—he was influenced to action—he built his ark—he saved not only his house, but his soul, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.

By the same victorious principle, did Abraham leave his country, his kindred, and his father's house—his fondest recollections, the friends of childhood, the haunts of early innocence, and every earthly

tie that bound his heart—he left them all at the call of God, and duty. He went out, not knowing whither he went, that he might sojourn in a foreign land, and wander for the rest of his life, as a stranger upon earth. What, then, was his support? It was not a common, and languid belief, but a peculiar, animated, and divine persuasion, that there is another, and a better world. It was the substance of things hoped for. “He looked,” says the Apostle, “for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.”

By faith also Moses, when he was come to years, when all that could fire ambition, or make temptation irresistible, glittered round him, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter—to be introduced in that splendid court, as the centre of its interest, fashion, excitement, and attraction; “choosing rather,” says St. Paul, “to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season.” And this choice he made, not as a painful sacrifice to duty, but with all the fulness of his heart, “esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt.” And why? Because a glorious immortality, and a present God, were opened to his faith. “He had respect unto the recompense of the reward.” “He endured as seeing Him who is invisible.”

Of faith thus fruitful of all good, it is expressly stated, that without it, “it is impossible to please God.” The fall of man has rendered him a stranger to the divine nature. And hence arises superstition in all its forms. Hence it is that God is every day offended, by impure worship, empty ceremonies, by prayers just uttered from the lips, by lifeless services, and dead works—as if he needed any thing; as if he were vain, and could be flattered; as if he were a tyrant, and loved to see us cringe like slaves; as if he were some senseless image, well befitting all this stupid mockery. Perseveringly as the world would force, as it were, these services upon God, he everywhere, in Scripture, indignantly disclaims them. “To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new-moons, and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting.” Such is the language uniformly addressed to those who “being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.” The main point of God’s own revelation is that we cannot save ourselves, but that he is both able and willing to save us. The very essence of salvation is holiness and happiness dwelling in the soul. But who can make himself holy or happy? He may long for that blessed frame of mind, and dig for it, as for hid treasure: but what power has man at his control, which can expel the spirit of uncleanness from his soul; or say to the storms, and heavings of a troubled heart, “Peace be still?” No, my brethren, we cannot save our-

selves, but salvation to the uttermost is freely offered. Salvation from the guilt of sin, in the atoning blood of Jesus; and deliverance from the power of sin by the operation of his Holy Spirit. God has no design respecting us, but to make us happy. This was his object in creating us, and it is his object in redeeming us. All that he desires is, that we should accept his mercies without money, and without price; that we should receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness from the God of our salvation. And is it any wonder if the man who rejects these gracious offers; who meets with cold suspicion, such unspeakable generosity, and such unbounded goodness, and who transacts with God as if he were "altogether such an one as himself," and were incapable of doing good without some valuable consideration; is it any wonder that such distortion of mind, and heart, cannot be acceptable to the Divine Nature? Is it any wonder that without full and filial confidence we cannot be acceptable to that Being, all whose requisitions are briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, "My son, give me thine heart;" or, in other words, that "without faith it is impossible to please God?" Nay, is it any wonder that the Scriptures should declare, in still sterner accents, that without faith there is no salvation—that "he that believeth not shall be damned;" that "he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him?"

And now, my brethren, these would be hard sayings, if faith were a gift partially bestowed, or capriciously denied. But it is not so: all shall have it, that will. The means are simple, and easy to be understood. Of these means, I shall briefly mention two, and then conclude. The first of these is, living up to the light we have; that is, conscientiously practising to the best of our power, what our hearts tell us, is our bounden duty. All is indeed, of divine grace. We can, in reality, do nothing of ourselves, but sin. Every good thought, and word, and work, descends from the Father of lights. But still, it is evident from experience, that God does, to all practical intents, and purposes, put much in our own power even before we fully feel the more immediate operations of his Holy Spirit. Thus, for instance, we may not be able to cast out the spirit of envy, or of unlawful desire from our souls: but we are able to control the outward actings of sin. We may not be able to love our enemies, after the similitude of the divine forgiveness: but we *can* bless those that curse us, do good to them that hate us, and pray for them that despitefully use us, and persecute us. We may not from experience know all the pleasures of a Christian Sabbath and call it a delight: but we can remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy; we can abstain scrupulously from doing, or even talking of ordinary business; we can be punctual in public, and private duties; our whole deportment may show that we honor, and reverence the Lord's Day. Such are a few of those numberless instances in which every conscientious man can act, though he may not have his feelings at command. Let him thus patiently continue in well-

doing; and his labour will not be in vain. Let him be assured that God indulgently beholds the feeblest efforts, if they be sincere—that a cup of cold water given for his sake, will not lose its reward—that this obedience will brighten into a happy intercourse with God—that from being servants, we shall receive the adoption of sons, and become the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus.

But the great means for the attaining that faith, which works by love, and bears every blessed fruit, is prayer. You perceive that I cannot mean by this, the going over some barren form of words, as the daily morning and evening task. But I mean the language of the heart: that importunity which men well know how to use when driven by distress to supplicate a fellow-creature; but which always finds in God, a mind and nature, prone to mercy, gentle and easy to be entreated; and whose delight it is to pity, to relieve, to give more than we can either ask or think. Enter, then, into your closet, and when, withdrawn from every other eye, you find yourself alone with God, pour out your heart before Him. These prayers may appear, for a time, unfruitful. But be patient, be fervent, be persevering, and the heavens will soften—the clouds will pour down their genial showers—Christ will manifest himself to your soul—and faith, “the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,” will open all its treasures. Have you ever seen one of the captive fowls of the air, immured, and pining in imprisonment, when some door of escape is opened, dart like an arrow from its cage, that it may again sing among the branches, and drink in the breath of the pure heavens? So will you find that faith can emancipate the soul—call it forth from the bondage of flesh, and sin, into its con-natural element, and native air—there to walk at liberty, and exult in the open day-light of eternity.

H. W.

THOUGHTS ON MEMORY AND HOPE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—The following observations, written to employ an hour of leisure, were judged by a friend to be deserving of a place in the *CHRISTIAN EXAMINER*. Although this opinion was probably less that of the critic than the friend, I offer them for your consideration, in compliance with his wish: observing only that, had they been intended for your periodical, they should have appeared in a fuller and more expanded form.

G. H. W.

To one who considers how entirely our rational and moral existence is made up of recollections of the past and anticipations of the future, how completely we are creatures of memory and hope, and how much the dignity of our nature consists in our being so; speculations concerning the nature of these qualities cannot be otherwise than interesting. One of the most remarkable properties belonging to these faculties is the power which they alike possess of gilding with delusive splendour, and investing with a halo of their own creation the objects which they suggest to the mind. Why our retrospective and prospective powers should have been so constituted by the beneficent Author of our being, will appear evident to one who considers how necessary such an arrangement is to our welfare, and even existence, here below. Did hope cease to smile, and to beguile with faithless promises, exertion, energy, and interest in life would vanish: and he knows little of human nature who will not readily admit, that the only adequate incentive to toil and labour consists in expectations never to be realized.

But if illusions as to the future are thus necessary, not less so are those which relate to the past. If memory were deprived of her pleasingly deceptive powers, those of hope would vanish also. Our anticipations must ever be dependent upon our experience. Hope may erect ærial castles, and draw highly finished pictures. But the materials and the colours must be supplied by memory. And were the former less costly, and the latter less brilliant than they are, the combinations of hope would cease to allure.

And here let us pause to consider this admirable contrivance of our all-wise and all-merciful God. There is little apparent connexion between the imaginary colours with which memory delights to adorn past scenes and events, and the vigour and enterprise of active life. And yet the one is necessary to the other. In such moral adaptations as this, do we not trace the hand of an Almighty contriver as clearly as in the physical ones pointed out by natural philosophers?

But whence do hope and memory derive this power? *Why* they possess it, we have seen; but *how*, remains to be explained. The end accomplished has been shown, but what the means are whereby this end is attained, we are still to inquire. The beneficial results are obvious, but the contrivance by which they are secured is not so clear.

Some will tell us that "'tis distance lends enchantment to the view:" but I am apt to look upon this rather as a statement than an explanation of the phenomenon. The causes which combine in producing this effect are, perhaps, manifold; and some of them, doubtless, operate with respect to the illusions of memory, which have no place with regard to those of hope. Pleasing associations of ideas, and a mind retentive of happy, and forgetful of unhappy events, will invest by-gone times with unreal attractions, which belonged not to them when present. But in looking for a more general and uniformly operating cause, it struck my mind, in the way of conjecture, that this might be found in the principle of self-love. What connexion there is between this feeling and the effects which I would ascribe to it, I will endeavour to point out.

Happiness is our beings' end and aim, the perfection of our nature, the object and full gratification of our utmost desires and loftiest ambition. Such being our constitution, there is in the mind a disinclination to admit, even to itself, that it has failed or will fail in the attainment of that, in the possession of which the dignity and glory of our being consists. From this disinclination then, and the self-deception resulting from it, I would deduce an explanation of the phenomenon in question. To scenes and objects of present perception this explanation cannot apply. To think ourselves happy, whilst we feel that we are not so, is a flight of imagination which even self-delusion cannot attain to. But in reference to past scenes and former times, this self-deceptive power exerts a mighty influence. The obscurity of distance invests objects with an indistinctness which permits imagination to deck them with colours of its own creation. Nor is a conviction of the understanding that such is the case sufficient entirely to dissipate the illusion. For as, when objects are clothed in the sober livery of twilight, the plastic hand of fancy pictures to the mind giants and spectres, which reason tells it day-light would exhibit in the more familiar forms of men and trees: so the hues, with which memory gilds former passages of our lives, are not entirely dispelled by the knowledge that they are wholly drawn from the imagination.

Thus, then, by a deeply seated desire in the human mind, of associating the idea of happiness with itself, aided by the power of the imagination and the obscurity of distance, would I explain the otherwise unaccountably attractive colours with which the objects of our recollection are adorned.

But if this illusive faculty exert so great a power in reference to the past, how great must be its influence with regard to the

future. If the limited range of our past experience afford such scope to the play of imagination, what shall check its flights in the boundless sphere of anticipation? If its colouring can invest well-known objects with such alluring charms, how enchanting must be the pictures of its own designing!

And is not this the case? Does not the same delusive power which scatters a few imaginary flowers upon the path of childhood in our remembrance, place us, in prospect, at the head of armies, at the helm of the state, or on a monarch's throne?

Such is my conjecture respecting the pleasing delusions of memory and hope; and, as to offer it for consideration was the object of the foregoing observations, I might here conclude. But lest, in speaking of hope's flattering and faithless promises as the appointed incentive to enterprise and toil, I should seem to forget that hope which will never disappoint, those anticipations which will be realized beyond all that we can ask or think, I will add a few words more. Sure I am that the day-dreams of the most romantic visionary never pictured forms of imaginary bliss so lovely as are the blessed realities which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive." And I am equally persuaded that the hope, which leads a Christian to expect a participation in these heavenly enjoyments is sure and steadfast, and will never fail. But this blessed truth does not militate against any principle which I have endeavoured to establish. In temporal matters, if we act like reasonable beings, we must act with a view to securing advantages to which we may never attain; we must pursue objects which will elude our grasp; we must strive after success which we cannot command. Ignorant of futurity, we yet are formed for action; and, such being our constitution, baffled schemes, frustrated projects, and disappointed expectations must ever be our portion. Nor let the Christian complain that he is not exempted from the common lot of humanity. Is it not consolation enough that, though all other hopes should fail, the hope of immortality still is his—that though this vain world should refuse to fulfil her promises, there is laid up for him "a crown of glory which fadeth not away?" If, then, there is one only instance in which our labours cannot prove abortive; if the future is veiled in impenetrable darkness, save where one isolated vista opens to the believer's view the unearthly glories of his future home, what madness to engage in every occupation, that only excepted in which a sure reward awaits our toil; to shut our eyes to that solitary ray which points to the haven of eternal rest!

HOOKER'S WORKS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—I was not a little surprised to light, the other day, upon a new edition of Hooker's Works, by one B. Hanbury, a Non-conformist; and of what temper and abilities I hope to show very plainly before I have done with him. Through the whole of his notes and prefaces the bad spirit of that party (unchecked even by the saintly meekness of his author) are perpetually manifesting themselves.

Most of these observations are offensive; a few ludicrous; but some so full of unmixed malignity, as to be capable of exciting the still stronger feeling of indignation. Of one, in which (on the authority of as sour a bigot as himself, Anthony Wood,) he makes an atrocious charge upon Bishop Taylor, I cannot trust myself to speak. That man's heart must be as black as his skull is thick, who can now give credit to such a calumny.* But I will pass on to more whimsical, and therefore less offensive examples. One need not go far to look for them. On the very title page, as if to give an earnest of the spirit which was to actuate him throughout, he has been careful to omit the usual epithets of "learned" and "judicious," which the veneration of former editors had conferred upon Hooker; and there stands the name, as bald and unhonored as that of Benjamin Hanbury himself, or the still more important Messrs. Holdsworth and Bull, his publishers. But another instance, still more ludicrous and characteristic, is to be found at page 11 of his introduction:

"The editor trusts that he shall not be found chargeable with presumption in asserting that, while he has been anxious to do justice to the author's talents, he has, in his notes and references, *which are distinguished from Hooker's by being placed between crotchets*, ventured to advance arguments meriting the most serious consideration of every candid and impartial inquirer after truth."

* Another example of the honesty of this man may be seen p. 28, where he represents Warburton as owning that he was only pleading for the *decorations* of society, in supporting an Established Church. But such a bungler is he that he gives a reference to the place alluded to, (p. 10 of *Dedicat.* to the "Alliance,") and so spoils all. Warburton is there recommending Lord Chesterfield to make it his care, as a minister, to polish the nation by the culture of learning and civility, but suddenly breaks off in his address, supposing it might be said, "that it was vain to *plead for the decorations of society* when the essence of it was in danger." Let the reader turn to the passage, and he will know how to appreciate Mr. Hanbury's good faith.

And in a note we have quoted from Warburton :

" Neal's History of the Puritans I took home to my house, and at breakfast time filled the margins quite through."

From which, no doubt, we are to conclude, that the new edition of Hooker is to be considered a sort of reprisals on the church for the bold sally of her daring prelate.* But, alas! could Independency put forth even a Warburton, the gigantic powers of such an intellect would be insufficient to cope with Hooker in the panoply of truth. But a *Hanbury*!—

" Non *tali* auxilio, nec defensoribus *istis* tempus eget."

Even I, the meanest champion of the good cause, may laugh to scorn so despicable an enemy.

κῶφον γὰρ βέλους ἄνδρσι ἀνάγκητος οὐτιδανδίο.

As, however, his angry fates engaged the poor man in a *skirmish* with "stout Gloucester," through the whole of his work, he resolved, it seems, to open it by giving him a signal overthrow in a fair pitched battle. To work, accordingly, he goes, upon the *Alliance*, a book which wiser heads than his have tarnished their reputation by attacking, and which the wisest will always value the most highly. Attend, then, Sir, and mark in how derogatory a style this Nonconformist David dispatches the Episcopalian Goliath. "In accordance with the principles we are labouring to assert, we find the Bishop saying, 'that civil and religious societies are essentially different is evident,' &c. (All. book I. c. v. p. 54.) It will now appear with what a praiseworthy and magnanimous consistency the Bishop allows that, "the true end for which religion is *established* is—civil utility." Noble admission! But here comes in the question, "what is civil utility?" Aye, indeed, here it comes, but not the answer; for let not the reader expect the weakest attempt (he *could* expect nothing better from such a scribbler) at confuting the arguments by which Warburton has shown, that civil utility requires an established religion. No. This, however absurd for the matter of it, would at least be to the purpose; and therefore, unworthy of a writer who is only dexterous in slandering the great and good. And now, what think you he is about to say? Why, hear him :

" Did all parties under the same government, or even every government

* Poor Warburton! Even in his grave the blockheads cannot let him rest. He seems fated (like his own Job) to lie still on his dunghill, and have his brains sucked out by owls. While he lived, not a son of stupidity could write a pamphlet or a folio without a fling at "The Author of the D. L.;" and since his death it has been much the same.

agree in the same opinion of it, (civil utility,) all would necessarily concur in applying the same means to the same ends."

And hereto he, very sapiently, appends a note of admiration !

"Dic, postume, de tribus capellis." This wondrous discovery seems, in other words, to stand thus. Could all parties, (Ben. Hanbury's, for instance,) or all governments, (e. g. that of the United States,) be made to see that civil utility requires the establishment of a religion, they would agree to the establishment of a religion for that purpose. A proposition which Warburton himself, captious and paradoxical as he is supposed to have been, would scarce have questioned. And now if nothing be useful save what even such as this respectable author can see to be so, I freely own that he has gained his point, and proved the contradictory of the Bishop's thesis, "That an established religion is expedient for the purposes of civil utility;" but not otherwise.

Having thus disposed of the main question, he proceeds to examine "Warburton's Principle of the Necessary Coincidence of Truth and General Utility;" by which that prelate endeavours to show, that the magistrate, by establishing that religion which is most beneficial, will also establish that one which is true. And here this ingenious gentleman actually outdoes himself, for search the writings of all the dunces who have ever run their hard pates against the paradoxical divine, from Tillard and Sykes down to B. Hanbury, and find me (if you can) a parallel for the following specimen of the three grand marks of their malignant race: "flippant self-conceit, inextricable confusion of ideas, and impenetrable stolidity." (Intr. p. 25.)

"If public utility and truth do coincide, then (the Bishop remarks) to provide for that utility is, at the same time, providing for truth, its inseparable associate.' That *this* is but a plausible hypothesis, and *therefore* unsound, appears from the principle, that the various opinions of public utility ought, if it were sound, to terminate in the same truth, it being one; but, as is well known, opinions do not thus terminate; consequently, public utility and truth do only incidentally coincide."

Had his nonsense been expressed correctly, it is clear the passage would have fallen short many degrees of its present perfection. But now all is as it should be.

"Totum teres atque rotundum."

What he *means* to say, you see, is, that Warburton's theory of the coincidence of truth and utility is only a plausible hypothesis; what by all the rules of grammar he does say is, that the self-evident hypothetic which asserts that *if these two do coincide*, then to provide for one is to provide for the other, is only a plausible hypothesis, and consequently unsound. From the expression pass we to the method. This is, as you observe, first to

prove the Bishop's hypothesis plausible ; because if so, it cannot be other than unsound. This being, as Mr. Bayes would say, a *rule* with our author, whose own hypotheses are certainly quite free from this damning mark, and as sound as glaring absurdity can make them. But so much by the way. And how, you may ask, is the theory to be proved plausible ? Why, it is shown to be unsound. That is ; it is first shown to be unsound, thence concluded to be plausible, from whence, if there be truth in Nonconformist logic, it follows that it is (as was before demonstrated) unsound.

Having thus cleared the manner, we may now proceed to the matter. The various opinions, argues he, of public utility, ought, if it (the hypothesis) were sound, to terminate in the same truth, it being one. Now, I think, under correction, that this is too cautious by a great deal. It seems to me that the proposition might be expressed much more strongly ; and perhaps our acute reasoner will permit me to state his argument thus :

Truth being one, men's opinions of it must be uniform. But men's opinions of public utility are not uniform ; therefore truth and public utility do not coincide : for it cannot be meant (however it may seem to be so meant) that the Bishop's hypothesis being granted makes the necessity for uniformity of opinion a jot more strong. This uniformity is very distinctly said to be the result of the unity of the truth ; and the argument, as I said, is, " If truth and utility coincide, then, truth being one, men's opinions concerning utility (i. e. truth) must be uniform also ; which, again, is only a particular case of the general theorem, that truth's being one, must ensure unity of opinion concerning it ; and in this it is plain that the soundness or unsoundness of the Bishop's theory has no place : so that now we may see how, by assuming an equally indubitable *minor præmise*, he might, with this general theorem in a hypothetical form, as properly have drawn a conclusion which should reduce his adversary to even greater straits than he is now forced into. For arrange thus, and the job is done :

If truth were one, men's opinions of it would be uniform : but men's opinions of many truths are not uniform ; therefore, truth is NOT ONE !

But the master-stroke yet remains behind ; for thus he proceeds :

" These, that the ' care ' of civil society, and the care of religious society are distinct, [which, Benjamin has told us, is in perfect accordance with his own principles,] and, that religion is *established* for civil utility, [which he styles a noble admission,] being the two positions upon which Warburton grounds his theory, the superstructure is entirely baseless, although it be denominated one of the first specimens of reasoning," &c. &c.

In other words, " the Bishop's theory, being *based* upon two

undeniably TRUE propositions, must be entirely *baseless*; and Horsley was such an ass as not to see this."

But, Sir, I will detain you and your readers no longer with this man. I have treated him with some severity; but not more than a libeller deserves, who has the audacity to speak of the Church of England as a mishapen monster, whose womb is filled with the brawling offspring of Luther, Calvin, Servetus, Socinus, Arminius; of Arius and Athanasius, and Simon Magus. (Intr. p. 18, note.) With which graphic description I will conclude, leaving it to the intelligent reader to find the original.

M. D.

ON POLEMICAL CONTROVERSY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—My pen almost trembles in my hand as I place it upon the paper, to ask, through your pages, a question, lest that question may give rise to some controversial discussion; and yet one unacquainted with the world might conclude there could be little danger of such a result, when the question I have to ask is this: *Cannot something be at least attempted to contract within the narrowest limits possible every field of polemical controversy?* I have long felt the importance of this object; but at the last assemblage of clergy in Dublin, during the week of religious meetings, it was still more forcibly impressed on my mind. I there observed that every veteran of the Gospel had one subject to begin and end with, whenever such a one addressed his younger brethren. "The message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another;" the "more excellent way"—the mark by which all men are to know the disciples of Christ's LOVE, seemed to be their heart's desire, and prayer to God for the church of Christ. Then in private: I was sometimes pained to see, here and there, one who, in time past, had been an humble, prayerful follower of the meek and lowly Jesus, now with his vizor down, not only prepared for, but seeking conflict; his feet not appearing, at least, to be shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace; so that I could hardly discern the dear friend of former days, or know that it was indeed the helmet of salvation which he wore, except for those well-known marks which neither time nor circumstances can ever efface. Cannot, then, something be even attempted to circumscribe within the narrowest possible limit—to wit, the limit of absolute necessity—every field of our controversies?

As my object is rather to draw forth from some one, to whom

God has entrusted power and influence, a solemn remonstrance, than to attempt to step out of my own humble place, I would ask, through you, Is there not some one amongst us, who, in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, can, in the first place, prove to the minds and hearts of our dear brethren, that in the controversies of these days, *there is too much of the word of man, and too little of the word of God?* And secondly, *that in the use of the word of God there should be a more earnest and prayerful desire manifested never to quote a text in a sense not sanctioned by the context, nor to use a scriptural term in a sense in any measure removed from the scriptural application of it?* Here would be at once two most wholesome limitations; and if, under the Divine blessing, such a remonstrance, as I hope to be the humble means of eliciting, were brought home to Christian consciences, I should expect, from the limitation of man's words and man's thoughts, less impediment to gospel love, and from the more close and accurate adherence to God's holy word, more of that faith we are promised shall spring from it.

I will just allude, by way of example, to two leading subjects of controversy: 1st. With reference more immediately to the point of there being more of *man's word used than is either needful or profitable*; I would instance that question which, from some cause or other to be found in man, and not in the Scripture, has, in a painful manner, agitated the minds of Christians, "*The personal coming of the Son of Man.*" If such rules as are now proposed had been observed in this discussion, the preliminary arrangement, in defining the point of disagreement, would have been, "Let us, before God, see how far we are agreed, and let not the least grain of united feeling be despised, that our ground of difference may be narrowed to the minimum."

1. All are agreed upon the simple truth, that the Lord of Glory is coming in person, even as the Apostles saw him ascend into heaven.

Let us not disturb this measure of agreement by any inquiry as to the great object of his coming, until we ascertain if there can be found any other undisputed point.

2. All are agreed, and with good reason, that Satan is not yet bound—that the period of millennial blessedness is yet future.

So far all are agreed. We should be thankful even for this, and then, with meekness and fear, proceed to the inquiry, What saith the Scripture as to the order of these two events? Is the period of rest from sin, and of rest in Christ, any where promised to arrive before the personal appearance of the Son of Man? If so, the advocates of the spiritual millennium have, from Scripture, established their view; if not, the conclusion of the advocates of the personal reign follows.

To take another leading example, more immediately with reference to the other point, viz: *the right use of the word of God*; I would instance the old, and still new controversy respecting "general" or "particular redemption." "One definition," saith

the old adage, "is worth a thousand arguments." And it seems to me that if the definition respecting this controverted point had been taken from Scripture, neither party would have applied the epithet *general* or *particular* to the work of redemption. I have been confirmed in this opinion by the perusal of two interesting sermons by Mr. Dodsworth, to which he appends, in support of his view, "The judgment of the Archbishop of Armagh" (Ussher) upon "the true intent and extent of Christ's death and satisfaction upon the cross." In the sermons, as in their title-page, we have the doctrines therein maintained denominated "General Redemption;" but in "the judgment" of the primate these words are never used. Mr. Dodsworth justly enumerates *two acts in the obtaining of freedom for captive sinners*. 1. There is, as he states it, the procuring of their freedom, which is done when the ransom is paid. 2. There is their actual deliverance, when the captive is set free. He then adds, "Strictly speaking, Redemption is the former of these acts."

The Archbishop, speaking of the finished work of Christ, whereby God's attributes are reconciled, so that he can be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus, uses in preference, as we find in "the Homily of the Salvation of Mankind," the term "SATISFACTION;" and says, p. 87, "When the remedy is prepared, we are never the nearer, except of his free mercy he be pleased to apply the same to us, that so the whole praise of our redemption, from the beginning to the end thereof, may entirely be attributed to the riches of his grace, and nothing left to sinful flesh wherein it may rejoice." Thus making the distinction, as made by Mr. D., between the work done, and the work applied; but more scripturally, as it appears to me, applying the term "SATISFACTION" to the former, and comprehending both the work done and the work applied under the term "redemption." "*Our redemption from the beginning to the end thereof.*"* In the only other expository work of his, at this moment within my reach, I find this corresponding statement: "The parts of his (Christ's) priestly function are two—satisfaction and intercession; the former whereof giveth contentment to God's justice; the latter soliciteth his mercy for the application of this benefit to the children of God in particular. Whereby it cometh to passe that God, in showing mercy upon whom he will show mercy, is yet for his justice no looser, being both just and the justifier of him which beleeveth in Jesus."

Again: "Our Mediator must not looke to procure for us a simple pardon without more adoe; but must be a propitiation for our sinnes, and redeem us by fine and ransome: and so, not onely be the master of our requests, to intreat the Lord for us, but also take upon him the part of an advocate to plead full satisfaction

* "Immanuel, or the Mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God," adjoined to the *Body of Divinity* published by Downcune, but previously published by the Archbishop himself.

made by himself, as our surety unto all the debt wherewith we any way stood chargeable."

If there be, as Mr. Dodsworth has a right to claim, a striking coincidence in the Treatise with the sentiments advanced in the Sermons, there also appears to be as striking a difference in the use of the terms applied.

The whole idea of ransom paid, freedom procured and applied, was, without controversy, conveyed by the heathen use of the term ἀπολύτρωσις. Good reason, therefore, should be shown for any departure from the received use of the word in the New Testament. Perhaps no critic more happily unites unction, learning and acumen, than Bengelius. When he comes to the first word of Rom. iii. 24, he says, "Repentē sic panditur scena amœnior." He proceeds: "ἀπολύτρωσις, redemptio à peccato et miseriâ. Redemptio est respectu hostium, et reconciliatio est respectu Dei. Atque hic voces ἱλασμοι et καταλλαγή iterum differunt; ἱλασμοι (propitiatio) tollit offensam contra Deum, καταλλαγή est ancept et tollit.

"1^o Indignationem Dei adversum nos. 2 Cor. v. 19.

"2^o Nostramque alienationem à Deo. 2 Cor. v. 20."

This application of the term "redemptio" is directly opposed to Mr. Dodsworth's use of it; and ἱλασμος, in its single meaning, distinguished from καταλλαγή, is given to express that which the advocates of general redemption would be understood to mean by their use of the word redemption. Mr. M'Neile, in his first lecture, lately delivered at Percy Chapel, says of Redemption: "This work is done; it was finished 1800 years ago; nothing can be added to it or taken from it. And for whom was it done? The scriptural answer, in its highest sense, is, that it was done for God himself; that his loving-mercy might flow forth in beneficence over a guilty world, while his righteousness remained unstained." The substance of all this I steadfastly believe—that a work has been done, finished for all, by which all herein stated has indeed been accomplished; but in this scriptural answer there appears to me a use made of the term redemption, ἀπολύτρωσις, which we do not find in Scripture.

Λύτρον (the ransom-price), from the same root, Λύω, to loose, never occurs, I believe, in the New Testament, without the preposition ἀντί either prefixed or following in the sentence, which, like ἀπό above, has the force of direct application to the person redeemed; either as a price set against him, as we say in matters of account; or in his stead, as in the case of substitution. So far, then, from any reason being found from the New Testament for the departure from the ancient use of the word (if I be right), the term "redemption," coming from the same root as the ransom, and strengthened, as to personal application by the preposition ἀπό in the word itself, and by the ἀντί with which the ransom is always associated, ought not to be otherwise used, as Primate Ussher seems to have thought. Besides, there is no necessity for this, when we have the term "propitiation."

1 John ii. 2. "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." Here the propitiatory victim who gave himself "an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour," ought, indeed, to be received and acknowledged by those for whom he gave himself, as having finished the gracious work for which his propitiation was offered. This finished work has placed Jehovah on the mercy-seat (*ἱλαστήριον*), and so placed him, according to the counsels of his own will, that he can not only extend mercy to his fallen creatures, but manifest and glorify his justice in this his mode of extending it.

In Rom. iii. 22-25, we have, in the words of the spirit of truth, God's appointed way for sinners to be made righteous in his sight. Here, if any where, we should expect the most accurate application of the human terms which God the Holy Spirit condescends to use, in conveying to us this great doctrine, so far as we are capable of understanding it. And here it seems to me, in verses 25, 26, *ἱλαστήριον*, propitiation is, *προέθετο*, publicly set forth, *εἰς ἔνδειξιν, της δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ*, for the demonstration of his righteousness, with the purpose also declared, "that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus;" while in verses 23-24, *ἀπολυτρώσεως* (redemption) is put in juxta-position with, and application to, justified sinners. Thus, if we consider doctrines apart from the terms in which they have been discussed, we may, in this contest, also find that the two extremes of opinion are not so wholly at variance as words have caused them to appear.

If there be, therefore, any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, let us not contend where we can avoid it; let us not dwell upon such passages as "All," in 1 Tim. ii. 6, where one can contend for the ranks and degrees of men of which the Apostle is speaking, and another for the universality of prayer enjoined in the first verse. Neither let us contend for the *πολλῶν* being taken for *πάντων*, in Matt. xx. 28, which, while one upholds, another, such as Rev. S. T. Bloomfield, D.D., says, "has no place in Scripture, nor, perhaps, in the classical writers." Nor, on the other hand, let any strive for limited salvation upon such a passage as Luke i. 68; while another can fairly say, that the application to "*his people*" there may be inclusive, and not exclusive, of the rest of mankind.

Let some one to whom God has given the power and the influence, come forward, and put the needful question to the consciences of his brethren in Christ, whether an exclusion of man's words and thoughts, as far as possible—a strict use of Scripture terms, and strict application of them, according to the context—may not, by bringing all to the simple point, "what saith the Scripture," do much to remove impediments from the diffusion of gospel love, and from the unbiassed dissemination of gospel truth.

Dear Sir, with much sincere regard, your faithful friend,

RUSTICUS.

THE HISTORY OF MOHAMMEDANISM AND ITS SECTS.*

THE subject of this interesting volume is one which is recommended on many accounts to the Christian inquirer. Whether for the purpose of contrasting the wondrous machinery of imposture which it exhibits with the pure and perfect system of our faith, or in prosecuting the less agreeable task of discountenancing the thoughtless cavils of the unbeliever, a minute consideration of the rise and progress of Mohammedanism asserts very forcible claims on those hours which the Christian allots to general study. We need not add, that even apart from these peculiar views of its subservience to the great subject of Christianity, this event must ever appear to all philosophic students of history to be truly second to none in importance, altering as it has done, the political relations of so vast an extent of the surface of our globe, and, with an influence alike durable and extensive, including at this day, under the dominion of degrading error, so large a proportion of our fellow-men. The character of the founder himself, the strange modifications of society on which his powerful mind had to operate, the unexampled successes which attended the labours of the martial prophet, and his still more victorious apostles, all combine to form a theme of no less diversified than impressive effect. And to those readers for whom our pages are more especially intended, there is at this period a commanding interest in all that concerns the religious history of the East. We will be permitted to speak more at length on a subject that agitates us often and deeply. The prospects of Oriental Christianity are big with wonder and change. The enormous fabric of priestly despotism in India is surely beginning to rock on its base, and that stupendous labyrinth of antique superstition, whose first original is lost in "the dark rearward and abyss" of time, and which, in despite of all our detestation of its bloody bondage, does compel the imagination to venerate what the reason and the feelings alike abhor; this, the dark slavery of Buddhist and Brahmin begins to tremble through all its thousand complications, before the glance of Christian truth. Its motionless calm was once the stillness of a crushing tyranny—we believe that it is now the outworn stupidity of dotage. Yes, we do predict—and may our hopes have the reality as well as the fervour of prophecy!—that in India, no more than in Ireland, can the mind of man be much longer

* The History of Mohammedanism and its Sects. By W. C. Taylor, B.A. (Published under the direction of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.) London, 1834.

successfully imbruted; and that the pomp of Juggernaut, as well as the "Procession" of Romish superstition—they are alike delusions, though we compare not the depth or depravity of the delusion—are morally incapable of abiding the purified intelligence of an age that freely disseminates the oracles of truth. We think that those who have accustomed themselves to regard the life of nations comprehensively, and in subordination to the providence of God, will not deny the plausibility of our hopes, when, fixing our eyes upon the later history of India we say that a period long before the termination of this century is destined to witness a mental revolution in that country. At all events, *our duty* is plain. We work in the midst of a dark labyrinth of providences: let it be ours calmly to follow the divine command, and freely to give to an unhappy race the peace which we have freely received, regardless of results which, as they are beyond man to declare, were never meant to be the guide of his actions.

With the prospects of India our present subject is intimately interwoven. A large proportion of the natives of that immense but unfortunate land are Moslem, though of a creed which has been deeply imbued with the visionary dogmas of Hindû theology. The late rapid progress of the power of the Sikhs (whose tenets are a compound of Brahminism and Mohammedanism) may inspire us with some hopes that the reputed strength of caste is not wholly invincible, and that that blood-cemented pile of close and intricate despotism may yet be rent to admit the light of day. We hope so: and if our hope be dashed with fears, we are heartily ashamed of them. There are, indeed, some declaimers of little head and no heart, who oppress our ears with ceaseless complaints of the danger that lies in the efforts of the brave and holy men who would enlighten eastern intellect; there are some, we say, who, while they profess a boundless liberality of instruction to the ignorant of their native land, would imprison India in sleep and darkness, for fear she should awake but to discover her English chain. To argue with such men were a penance; they can neither understand nor feel. Not to them, but to the religious spirit of the land, we say, and we say boldly, Perish that empire, if it cannot exist (as these wise advocates allege) except on ignorance and idolatry! Perish that foreign sway, if it oblige a Christian land to permit the idols to be forged at Manchester that are to be adored as gods at Calcutta!* —Perish—*which?* The parent country which countenances such deeds, or the bondage which it enforces over soul and body? Let an avenging God decide!

Much has been written on the subject of Mohammed and his

* Our denunciations are conditional. *If* these things—and these things *are done*—be necessary to the authority of Christian England in Hindûstan, God will not bless it, and we dare not.

creed, whether in the form of general speculation, or of continuous history: yet Mr. Taylor's work, so far from being superfluous, really satisfies a desideratum in our literature. The volumes of Gagnier and Prideaux are out of the reach of common readers, and the valuable treatise of Dr. Forster is rather a disquisition than a narrative. In extensive histories the life of Mohammed can of course occupy but the same extent which is devoted to numerous events of equal importance; nor are we wholly satisfied with the execution of any of them. The details of Mohammedanism, in the "Universal History," are tastelessly compiled and cumbrous, while the gorgeous tale of Gibbon, though brilliant with even more than his usual splendour, is too brief to satisfy curiosity, and influenced more or less by that unfortunate determination to see excellence in every religion but the religion of Christ, which, on these subjects, injures sometimes the accuracy of his details, and always the correctness of his general impression. Mr. Taylor, therefore, honourably occupies a post of considerable importance in our useful literature. He has also had the advantage of consulting the copious stores of Eastern lore which the Committee of the Oriental Translation Fund has lately presented to the curiosity of England, and thereby has been enabled to add colour and vivacity to the delineation of Asiatic history by many spirited details of Asiatic manners.

The life and doctrines of Mohammed are judiciously introduced by a view of the state of the East, and especially of the Arabian wilds, previous to the advent of the prophet; with a particular account of those extravagant traditions to which the crafty leader pointed the historical references of his Koran, and in appealing to which he sagely enlisted in his cause the prepossessions at once of the Arab, the Christian, and the Jew. With many of these amusing legends our readers are doubtless familiar; but they ought not to forget the peculiar and very forcible kind of evidence which they afford to the authenticity of our biblical records. From Christianity—including in that comprehensive term the preparatory dispensation of the chosen race—have originated most of the numberless perversions of Indian, Persian, Arabic error: they are at once its homage and its contrast; for, while they disfigure its majestic simplicity with all the licentious phantasies of oriental imagination, they yet attest, by the antiquity and prevalence of the absurdity, the still greater antiquity and the substantial truth of the important facts which they distort. No historical illusion is wholly without foundation—no romancer weaves his spider's web of fancies without *some* solid material to sustain the fluttering network. The phantasmagoria of Eastern superstition presents us indeed with a wild scene—figures gigantic and uncouth, colours dusky and unreal—but all this mystic portraiture cannot come forth uncaused; the terrifying deception is but the enormous image of a simple and beautiful picture; and to those who understand the

laws of the delusion, its spectral forms only prove the prior existence of the fair original whose lineaments are thus gloomily reflected. And hence, when we find among the traditional lore of the sons of Ishmael the name of their progenitor preserved unaltered, the chief events of the lives of Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, Solomon, familiar to the tents of the Bedouin, and though, of course, exaggerated and multiplied by the fervid fancies of these wild historians, yet clearly recognizable in all points of importance—can we refuse to believe that the fame of these heroes of our biblical narrative was diffused and acknowledged far beyond the limits of the sacred land?—That we possess a story confirmed by the continued assent of a class, whose records, if liable to be swelled in the accidents by enthusiasm, were at least not likely to be falsified in the essentials by fraud? In the Eblis that affrights the wanderer of the desert we recognize the Satan of our Bible; in the genii and peris that ruled the pre-adamite world we meet the fanciful transmutation of the fallen angels of our story; in the names of the magicians and enchanters who swayed the hosts of ideal beings, we have the Enoch, the Solomon, the Elias of the Scriptures. The antiquity of these traditions is indisputable: Mahomet professed to base his religion on the tenets which they include; and long before his era the idolatrous worshipper at the Caaba boasted a descent from Abraham, and appealed to the mystical volumes of Adam and of Seth. An intercourse with the Jewish people might modify and corroborate the national belief, but it is impossible that it could wholly originate it. On the contrary, the dreamers of Arabia charged the dreamers of the Talmud with misrepresenting the annals of their race, and as little sympathy existed as might have been expected, between the lineage of Isaac and the sons of the son of Hagar.*

As to the character and achievements of the prophet, little could be added by any historian to the knowledge we already possess. Mr. Taylor has truly regarded him as combining some sincerity in youth with much more imposture in age; and for any more minute decision we have not, and are never likely to have, adequate materials. The early history of his career is well described in the following passage:

“ For the next fifteen years of his life, we have little better than conjecture to offer. He still retained his contemplative disposition, and retired

* Is it not much more rational to consider the legendary parts of the Talmud itself as, in a great measure, the eager and exaggerating register of previous tradition, the digest of popular fiction, than as the entire produce of wanton falsehood? Many of the inventions of these often amusing, and oftener stupifying volumes were doubtless—like many of the marvels of our own saintly biography—current in the mouths of the common people long before they were re-issued from the desk of the studious Rabbi.

from the world one month in every year, to enjoy the luxury of meditation in the caverns of Mount Hira. Tradition obscurely hints at conversations which he had at various times with Monks and Jewish Rabbins; it would, indeed, be impossible that a person of his eminent abilities could have been indifferent to the religious discussions, which at that period shook all western Asia. He was probably a sincere inquirer after truth, but when monastic legends were presented to him instead of the Gospel, and Talmudic tales in the place of what was spoken by the prophets, his naturally strong mind discovered that true religion must be something more pure and simple than the speculations of dreaming monastics, whether Jew or Christian. Had he enjoyed an opportunity of discovering the simple evangelical truth, abstracted from the additions made to it by human craft, or human folly, he might have received it as a solution of all his difficulties, but there is good reason to believe that he never saw the Bible in its simple purity, and was only acquainted with the forged imitations and countless perversions of the sacred text. Solitary meditation is the parent of a regulated enthusiasm; not the fierce flame which a breath can kindle, and a breath extinguish, but that sober, steady determination, which presses on to a definite object, using every means for its accomplishment that prudence or wisdom may dictate. It is not unusual for the mind in solitude to embody, as it were, the phantasms of imagination, and mistake its own creations for absolute existences. Inexplicable visions have appeared to men of the strongest intellect; nay, such men are peculiarly liable to these deceptions; the gigantic figure that foretold Cromwell's greatness, and the ghost of Cæsar in the tent of Brutus, were the creations of powerful intellect under high excitement. We do not, therefore, stigmatize Mohammed as a liar, for saying that the angel Gabriel commanded him to undertake the prophetic mission; it is very possible, nay, it is highly probable, that a vivid imagination imposed upon his senses, and that he really believed himself divinely commissioned.

"Mohammed first announced his commission to his wife Kadijah; she instantly declared her belief on him, saying, "I have long been persuaded that thou wouldst become the prophet of the Arabians." The next converts were Zeid, Mohammed's slave, his cousin Ali, the son of Abu-Thaleb; Abu-Bekr, a man of considerable influence with the Koreish, Othman, and several other persons of distinction. To all these he gave the name of Mussulmans, that is, "persons wholly resigned to the will of God." Devotees making similar professions, have never been wanting in the East; the Jews had their Essenes, the Christians their Monks, the Persians their recluse Magi, and the Brahmins and Buddhists a countless variety of ascetic sects. The ambition of Mohammed was at first limited to the establishment of an order, or sect; it was directed by circumstances to the foundation of an empire. To fix the faith of his followers, he pretended to have frequent revelations from heaven; and here we begin to find imposture mingling with his enthusiasm; he declared that he was himself unable to read, but that the messages from heaven were read to him by the angel Gabriel, in order that he might recite them to his secretaries.

Such was the first origin of the Koran, a word which signifies, "that which ought to be read." A more particular account of this extraordinary book will be found in another chapter.

"For some time the new doctrines were propagated in secret; three years elapsed before Mohammed ventured to propound them to his own family; he prepared a feast, to which he invited his uncles and his other relatives, but an accident broke up the assembly before he could find an opportunity of addressing them. On a second occasion he was more fortunate; the guests, in number about forty, expressed an anxiety to hear his statement, and Mohammed eagerly embraced the opportunity. His speech, if we may believe the traditions respecting it, was admirably calculated to make a deep impression; he exposed the follies of idolatry with severe ridicule, asking what reliance could be placed on senseless images, whose eyes saw not, and whose ears heard not? In solemn language he announced the truth of the divine unity, and called on them to worship the one God, the Creator of heaven and earth, the moral Governor of the universe, who hath prepared a recompense in a future life for the evil and the good. Finally, in a spirited peroration, he exclaimed, 'Is there one among you who wishes to be my vizier and lieutenant, as Aaron was to Moses?' The young Ali responded to the call, and Mohammed declared him for the future invested with vicarial authority. Of the other guests some believed, but others mocked, saying to Abu-Thaleb, 'Hereafter you must be obedient to your son.'"

The close of this passage contains the point which is unquestionably the most remarkable in the entire history, we mean the announcement and firm maintenance of the great doctrine of the divine unity, by this extraordinary man; a steadiness of resolve for which it is impossible to assign any direct political motive, and for which, therefore, it will, we think, be found difficult to account on any hypothesis but that of a partial sincerity. The Jews and Christians whose favour, it might be supposed, was sought by such a creed, possessed no force comparable to that of the idolatrous Arabs; and though chance made the former his friends or instruments for a brief period, the doctrine had been promulgated previous to their conversion.

We shall not venture to suggest a proposition so dangerous as that the will of the true God can in any sense (save the awful and mysterious *permission* of evil) be said to have spoken from the lips of the false prophet. It is true that the providence of God can mercifully overrule moral disorder to the purposes of good; it is true that many agents of his truth have been occasionally—such is humanity—the fallible ministers of error; and that, on the other hand, the enemies of that truth have, unawares, chequered their own darkness with a ray or two of the genuine light; but we conceive such a solution to be inapplicable in the present instance, for many reasons. Among them we would select this forcible one, that the facts of the case appear wholly to contradict such a supposition. The existence

of a few correct doctrines in the creed of Islam has not, even in the lowest degree, succeeded in disciplining its professors for a future Christianization. We were once inclined to entertain such hopes, but a more mature reflection has taught us to abandon them. When we say that the facts of the case negative this amiable but somewhat enthusiastic hypothesis, we allude to the actual immorality of the system—for the twelve hundred years of its existence, flagitious and preeminent—which, arising from the very essence of the religion, its heartless tenets and voluptuous rewards, affords a practical demonstration, not only of its incompatibility, but of its direct and utter hostility with every thing Christian. Where Christianity is concerned, a rivalry of temper is far more formidable than a rivalry of tenets. Nay, we would carry this observation farther, and venture to assert what we think may be laid down as a principle in the philosophy of religious conversion, that, when the temper of systems is, as in this case, directly adverse, the difficulty of conversion almost always increases in proportion to the number of merely speculative dogmas common to both. The reason of this is, that in such cases the apostle of truth has no means of arresting the *attention* of his auditors; there is no positive novelty in his propositions, and, consequently, there is nothing presented to the mind of the victim of delusion which can startle him into a doubt of his own security. We will suppose a Christian missionary to address a worshipper of Boodh, to talk to him of redemption, of sanctification, of peace won through trust in the Son of God: it is impossible but that if the idolater be possessed of the average share of intelligence, he must sometimes be forced upon the soul-awakening conclusion, "If what this man says be true, I must be indeed lost; for the creed I hold does not contain a particle of this machinery of salvation; the personages, the events, the doctrines of this scheme are a something wholly new and exclusive of all others. If this be true, all else must be radically false: *Can it then be true?*" Here is the most favourable condition in which the mind of an unbelieving man can be placed; and this is produced by the mere novelty of the system. But conceive the same detail addressed to a follower of the Koran. He perceives in it little more than the very points which he has himself theoretically acknowledged, and the differences, though of tremendous import, and though to us so obvious that we can scarcely conceive them evaded, are assuredly of the very kind which a gross, sensual, and uneducated mind is slow to apprehend. The unity of God? He receives it as the fundamental article of his faith. The veracity of the Christian Bible? He ranks it as second only to the Koran. The lofty character of Christ? The Koran itself abundantly recognizes it. Resignation to the will of God? Election? They are the very corner-stones of Mussulman morality. But then, atonement, redemption, sanctification? Alas, these things are too ethereal for the indolent Islamite. Content with a creed

which embraces, as he deems, the flower of all creeds, he lethargically listens to the details of a faith which cannot even rouse his attention, and of peculiarities which he can scarcely see to be peculiar: he marvels much that the Christian (whom he only knows as a topic of reprobation bequeathed from sire to son) can argue so earnestly about the rival claims of Issa and Mohammed, or can dream that a true believer will really desert the faith of his forefathers, and incur the manifold inconveniences of such a change, for a few shadowy and speculative differences. Such, we imagine, must ever be the operation of a creed which cannot startle the careless voluptuary by the surprise of novelty: the real diversities may be immense, but if they be not at once recognizable, if they be differences not of personages so much as of doctrines, it will be difficult not merely to produce change, but even to obtain an auditor. The strongest illustration of this truth is to be found in the features of the Romish controversy with Protestantism. We appeal to all those who have engaged in such discussions, whether they have not observed a very marked difference in the tone and temper of an antagonist, according to the particular nature of the subject of dispute. Speak to a Romanist of the doctrinal distinctions which are obvious to sense and easily reducible to logical expression—for instance, the tenets of infallibility, transubstantiation, or purgatory—and you have at once roused his attention: address him upon those views which, if possible more important, affect rather the emotions than the reason—such doctrines as the exclusive dependance on faith in Christ, and the nothingness of human works as claims on Divine justice—and he becomes either listless and inattentive, or thoughtlessly pleads that his own creed encourages the very dispositions you recommend. We repeat, then, that where a false religion, such as the Mohammedan imposture, retains many of the principal names and facts of the true, but distorts those facts, degrades their importance, and overlays them with debasing error; and where there is combined with the admission of those rudiments of truth an utter discordance in temper and disposition, that false creed is farther from regeneration and reform, than a creed which has not one single tenet in common with the truth, but is an unmingled mass of fable, alike in its historic and its doctrinal theology. Both, indeed, are a mighty problem for the providence of God to solve; but we would say, that in all human calculation the former is a case of deeper and darker degradation. As we have said, the former has just enough of knowledge to neutralize the salutary effect of novelty, to hide the importance of the question, and to suggest to indolence and sensuality that the differences do not counterbalance the inconveniences of change. The latter cannot in some instances but be roused to reflect that the question is a question of life and death; one, on the decision of which, happiness and misery must forcibly depend; one which admits neither of delay nor of compromise, but calls for investigation by

every principle of hope and terror. Yet it is not to be denied, we can contemplate with less distaste the history of the establishment of *modified* error, before it has proved its corruptness by the lapse of ages of depravity; and we avow it, the scene is not without its sublimity for our minds, when the victorious merchant of Mecca entered his native city at the head of an army of Iconoclasts, and proceeding to the temple where mute idols had sat in senseless pomp for ages, broke them to pieces, one by one, and impostor as he was, taught a lofty element of truth, "THERE IS BUT ONE GOD!"

Undoubtedly he was a great genius, a man of colossal mind, and in his wildest ambition, princely and sublime. There is something which we think no diversity of opinions can prevent a cultivated mind from regarding, with even extorted awe, in the career of a great religious chieftain—a leader who aims at the minds of men not less than their bodies, who will govern their inmost souls, their hopes, fears, beliefs, or not govern at all—a being thus clad in all the terrors of the unknown world—to his followers more a spiritual Presence than a human hero—one who, while a Cæsar or a Napoleon retires to his tent, to be maligned or forgotten, is still present, awfully present, in the prayers of every shuddering peasant in his camp, a dim Phantom of hope and dread, believed to wield alike all the promises of heaven and all the tremendous penalties of hell. Every form of earthly ambition is in its object truly vulgar to the philosophic spectator; but we forget our philosophy when we gaze on the Satanic splendour of such ambition as this. And if it be too overpowering for the undazzled eyes of those who merely contemplate its distant effects, what must it be to the gorgeous miscreant himself who has reached an elevation so unnatural to humanity? Deserted by the sympathies of his race—for who can sympathize with the mate and minister of God?—alone in a gloomy solitude of unreal thoughts, the man, in blasphemously daring to grasp the weapons of Omnipotence, has felt the helplessness of his human soul. His meditations are a maze of ghastly dreams; right and wrong, truth and falsehood, become gradually confounded; and in the turbulent chaos of vanity and distrust, and pride and terror, the lost hypocrite at last yields to the adoration of his fellow-men, and madly *deems it his due!* In short, the deluder is deluded. A conception too strong for the brain of man has vanquished him; Imagination, fed with ceaseless worship, swells to a gigantic bulk; reason sinks into the office of only accrediting her delusions, and the wretch absolutely learns to cherish a giddy and insane faith in his own lie. The portentous example before us did actually, we believe, run through some such cycle of alternate infatuation and imposture as we have mentioned. He began with a little sincerity, and he probably ended with at least as much. Imposture filled up the interval; and if its reaction was not as total a prostration of reason as has been described above, it was only because the deceiver was Mohammed—only because an intellect of ex-

traordinary power could pervert the world without being wholly perverted, and, enslaving others, still preserve the mastery of itself. But those who peruse the records of Mohammed's death-bed will, perhaps, be inclined to conclude that, even in his case, the daily poison of a life had produced, in a very perceptible degree, its terrible effects on the reason.

"When the symptoms of dissolution began to appear, he ordered his family to be assembled round his bed, to hear his final directions respecting his funeral. 'When I am dead,' said he, 'and my body has been washed and shrouded, you will place my corpse at the verge of the tomb, until Gabriel and the other angels of God come to pray for my repose. You shall then approach one by one, and pray that God may be gracious to my departed spirit; and afterwards you may admit the people. My peace I bestow upon all here present, and I charge you to give it in my name to those who are absent. I take you, also, to witness that I bequeath my benediction to all those who shall follow me in the true faith, henceforth and for ever.'

"Soon after this, when several of his friends were together in his apartment, he demanded pen and ink, for the purpose of writing a new Korán. The proposal gave rise to a scene of unseemly contention, some insisting that his desires should be gratified, others asserting that the Korán they had already was sufficient. With some difficulty the room was cleared, and no strangers were again admitted. On the day of his death, he bathed his hands in water, exclaiming, 'O God, fortify my soul against the terrors of death.' Soon after, he became quite faint. His last feeble words were, 'O God — yes — with my fellow citizen on high,' a name he frequently gave to the angel Gabriel."

Mr. Taylor presents us, in the fifth chapter of his work, with a very clear summary of the Mohammedan system of belief. It was originally compiled by a learned Sonnite doctor; and when combined with the excellent illustrations which the present editor has appended to its concise details, forms a very complete *corpus theologicum* of the faith of Islam. Some of these illustrations consist of curious legends selected from the *Mishcat-ul-Mas'abih*, a vast collection of Mohammedan traditions published at Calcutta. The invention displayed in these marvels is unfortunately much more extravagant than ingenious. The hideous nightmares of rabbinical fancy it is unnecessary to reprobate; and the ponderous follies of an imagination utterly a stranger to grace, or beauty, or sublimity, are as grotesquely repulsive in the traditional history, as in the statues and temples of Hindú idolatry.

The lives and conquests of the first four Khalifs follow the history and doctrines of their chief. In that amazing range of victory, which extended the sway of Islam from India to the western ocean, there is opportunity for an animated and diversified narrative; and, without minutely recording the successive defeats of all who opposed the warriors of the desert, Mr. Taylor has furnished a succinct abstract of the results of the whole. And can we wonder at these results? Can any age of the world

be instanced in which the physical, religious, and moral degradation of mankind has been so miserably conspicuous? And how striking is the contrast between the corrupted slaves of a deformed Christianity, which was incapable either of animating enthusiasm or consoling defeat, and the wild, but lofty fanatics of the Arabian sands, actuated by a gross delusion, indeed, but yet by one which, in many instances, elevated the sentiments, and always infused a grand and appalling singleness of purpose. *They* were the only *men* of their time; *they* were, by inherent right of nature, the legitimate sovereigns of the world. Where, to meet the desperate enthusiasm of the Arab's faith, was *now* the Christianity of Christ? Clouded by the vanity of dogma, and enfeebled by the inconsistency of rival speculations alternately forced upon the purity of the Gospel, could it be said to flourish in the busy controversy of the Monothelites, or the pertinacious quarrels of the "three chapters?" We are far from daring to intimate that, even amid these turbulent times, piety might not have bloomed in her unobtrusive homes, or that the golden line of successive holiness, that connects our age with that of our Master, has ever been utterly snapped; but who does not discern in the defensive energies of the external church, in the times of the Saracen irruption, an awful prostration of intellect and will, and in the bloody achievements of the sons of Ismael a merited chastisement of debased Christianity?

We are here tempted to add a few words with regard to certain sceptical fantasies, on which Mr. Taylor has written, with truth and eloquence, in the introductory paragraphs of his volume, but to which his whole narrative is obviously the clearest of all replies. There are two points of view in which the successes of Mohammedanism may possibly affect an inexperienced mind with sceptical apprehensions. The first suggests generally that the extensive propagation of a religion requires no supernatural aids, and applies that inference specially to Christianity. The second presumes that the permission of such an empire of imposture is incompatible with the truth of Christianity, inasmuch as it cannot be explained on what grounds the God of Nature, if he be in a peculiar sense the God of Christians, could admit so wide a diffusion of error in the face of his church, and tolerate so triumphant an insult to his prerogative and his people. There is a third view—that which compares the Christian and the Mohammedan revelations, and fears that, in such a competition, the Bible may not always assert its supremacy to the Koran. But we write for the educated, and to them it is unnecessary to state that the Koran has absolutely nothing of value which is not manifestly borrowed from the inspiration of our Scriptures—little which is not as evidently the offspring of occasional policy, and almost as little which is not deformed by immorality, and neutralized by contradiction.

To the former of these views, after the thousand refutations which it has received, it is quite needless to advert. The history

of each establishment is, as we have before observed, the best, indeed the only, answer to so frivolous a cavil. Those who can compare the chicanery of policy, and the violence of blood, and the artful excitement of vulgar human nature in all its predominant propensities, with the absence alike of influence and of craft, the rejection of force, and the determinate condemnation of all that is most dear to the natural heart—such objectors may obtain the tribute of pity, but assuredly cannot deserve the honour of confutation. And as to the presumption from assumed notions of Divine Providence, we beseech its employers to remember that atheism alone can consistently urge it. If there be a God, there must be religion; for religion is the immediate result of the necessary relation between that God and his creatures. If, then, it be a tenable objection to any given religious system, that at any stage of its existence it is permitted to meet with neglect, contravention, or disaster, the religion of nature—that elementary religion which flows from the admission of a presiding being—must at once be similarly rejected; for, unquestionably, every hour that merges in eternity bears with it a burden of man's blasphemy, contempt, and at best forgetfulness, of the Divine Governor of the universe. And since, when the religion of nature is abandoned, the God, whose existence is essentially connected with it, is likewise abjured, the presumptuous speculator in the mysteries of infinity and eternity, who denies the divine origin of Christianity, because its march has not been a perpetual triumph, is saved only by inconsistency from the lifeless vacuity of atheism. And if we recur to the facts of the case, we shall find that the objection exaggerates their real importance. The thunder-cloud of Saracen domination brooded over Europe but for a time, and burst in a shower of blood on the field of Tours; while the authority of Mohammedanism in Asia, superseding the insanity of idol worship, was, considered in itself, though not as an approximation to Christianity, a positive amelioration. And were it not for the influence of that hopeless voluptuousness to which we have before alluded, the Moslem, who admits the prophetic mission of our Lord and the divinity of his Gospel, might perhaps be considered as, at least, not likely to be a much more difficult subject for conversion than the Jew who denies both, and who joins to that denial, prejudices as obstinate as the Mohammedan, and admissions of truth quite as unprofitable or delusive.

The best account which we have yet seen of the sects and monastic orders of Islamism is to be found in the volume before us. With a concise completeness not often surpassed, the author has contrived to give us, in a short compass, a most satisfactory picture of a class of persons whose habits and history are by no means generally known to the ordinary readers of Europe. And it is profoundly interesting to observe how similar is the progress of religious error in all ages and climes, and how uniformly prone is the guilty heart of man to substitute ceremony for emotion, and penance for penitence. Alas! how easy a thing it is

to bend the knees—how hard a thing to bow the heart! And when the Romanist translators of the New Testament changed the mental act into the corporeal, how devoutly were they sacrificing to the spirit of human nature! To “do penance” is, in a manner, the *natural* result of a consciousness of crime in even a hardened human heart. The wretch who has done a deed that wrings his frightened soul with remorse, tears his hair, and rends his flesh in the first transports of his anguish; he is his own executioner; the conscience calls aloud for the punishment of the offender, and the offender feels relief in inflicting it. Yet, that man who thus discharges the “penance” of nature, in mutilating his body, carries within him a soul unchanged and unimpressible; and his feelings continue to foam along in a current which the additional austerities of a cloister may, indeed, congeal, but can never of themselves purify. Who hates not himself when the rapture of his vice is quenched in remorse? and who that hates himself will not love to persecute his own body and soul? But there is as much difference between hatred of past vice and the possession of virtue, as between the detestation of a tyrant and the blessings of freedom. And the deluded victim, who rushes from crime to torture, is only urged by the same feelings of self-detestation as produce half the suicides that shock the living world. We are not to anticipate hell, but to labour for heaven; self-denial is not an end, but a means for a high and happy end; neither are we to dream that a life of agony on earth must of course defraud God of the demands of his eternal justice. Above all, is it necessary to add, that we must banish the monstrous belief of a personal satisfaction for our own abominations—the belief that a creature, whose every instant is equally due to God, can atone by the virtue—or, what is far lower, by the pain—of one hour for the guilty pleasures of another. Let not our readers be offended at the caution. So congenial is that delusion to the heart of man, that, in spite of Protestantism and the Bible, we have known it lurk in the unconscious soul of more than one worthy Christian, and infect the very springs of conscience. Yet abstinence may abate the tumour of passion; the bodily discipline of the monastic may—the chance is as strong against it, yet it *may*—produce, not spiritual pride but abasement; and we object not to penances, but to the motives that so often induce them.

There are thirty-two principal orders of Dervishes in the Mohammedan communion.

“Of these orders, the most numerous, and perhaps the most influential, is that of the Nacshbendies, who resemble more the confraternities in Roman Catholic countries, and the Methodists of England, than regular Monks. Without quitting the world, they bind themselves to the strict observance of certain forms of devotion. Every day they repeat the *Istaghfar* (Lord, have mercy upon us!) at least once; the *Salavát* (Lord, give thy peace and blessing to Mohammed and his family, as thou gavest them to Abraham, &c.) seven times; the first chapter of the *Korán*, seven times; and the

94th and 112th chapters of the same book, nine times. They meet, like the Methodists, once a week, and, in the presence of their class-leaders, go through the additional forms of devotion. The reigning Emperor of Morocco is said to be a member of this confraternity; he is the author of the following hymn, which is daily recited from the minarets throughout his dominions, after the first proclamation for morning prayer:

Glory be to God alone!
 The shades of night are fled away,
 The ruddy dawn leads in the day,
 And light once more to mortal eyes is shown.
 Bow before the Eternal King,
 To his praise loud anthems sing,
 For all the benefits bestow'd,
 By him, the one, the only God.

"But the organization of the other orders is much more rigid. Most of them impose a noviciate, the length of which is usually determined by the opinion that the community forms of the candidate's progress. He is taught to repeat the list of the Divine attributes, seven only being communicated at a time, and he is bound to tell all his dreams to his superior, who pretends from them to determine the candidate's progress in divine knowledge.

"The Mevlevies are, for many reasons, the most remarkable of the rigid orders. A thousand and one days is the mystic number prescribed for the noviciate, and the place where the candidate receives elementary instruction in spiritual knowledge is no other than the kitchen of the convent. During his noviciate, he is called 'the scullion;' and it is by 'the head-cook' that he is presented to the abbot, or superior, as worthy of full admission. The cook assists at the ceremony of initiation, and holds the head of the novice, while the superior pronounces over him some verses of the founder, to the following effect:

He who the chains of evil lust has broke,
 And cast aside his passions' fatal yoke,
 Enjoys a noble power and glorious reign,
 Which from the Prophet he alone could gain.

The prayer called Tekbú is then chanted; after which the chief, or abbot, places upon the head of the novice the cylindrical cap, peculiar to the Mevlevies; the candidate then sits down besides the cook, while the superior briefly pronounces a form of admission, enumerates the duties of his profession, and recommends the new member to the prayers and good wishes of his brethren.

We cannot deny our readers the following curious details:

The mystic dances of the Mevlevies differ from those of the other orders, and are very singular exhibitions. Nine, eleven, or thirteen of the fraternity squat down on sheep-skins in a circle; the floor of the dancing-room is circular, its design being manifestly borrowed from a tent. They remain for nearly an hour perfectly silent, with their eyes closed, as if absorbed in

meditation. The president then invites his brethren to join in reciting the first chapter of the Korán, 'To the honour of God, his prophets, especially Mohammed, the saints, Mohammed's wives, disciples, and descendants, the martyrs, the khaliphs, the founder of the order,' &c. Prayers are then recited in chorus, and afterwards the dance begins. All quitting their places at the same time, range themselves on the left of their superior, and slowly advance towards him, with folded arms and downcast eyes. When the first of the Dervishes comes nearly opposite the president, he salutes, with a low bow, the tablet in the wall over his head, on which is engraved the name of the founder of the order; he then, with two springs, gets to the right side of the president, and, having humbly saluted him, begins his dance. This consists in turning on the heel of the left foot, with closed eyes and extended arms, advancing slowly, and making, as it were, insensibly the round of the apartment. He is followed by the second and third Dervishes; after which all begin spinning on the foot, and moving round, taking care to keep at such a distance that they may not interfere with each other's motions. This fatiguing process continues two hours, interrupted only by two brief pauses, during which the superior chants some short prayer. When the performance draws towards a close, the superior joins in the dance, and the whole concludes with a prayer for the royal family, the clergy, the members of the order, and the faithful throughout the world.

"The exhibition of the Rûfalies is still more extraordinary; it is divided into five acts; in the last of which they lick red-hot swords, cut and wound themselves with knives, and lacerate their bodies until they sink exhausted. The superior, then going round, breathes upon the wounds, after which they are carefully dressed.

"Most of the orders have convents; the married members are not permitted to bring their wives into the monastery, where they must sleep twice a week, but especially on the nights preceding their holy dances. Only one order, that of the Bektashies, can properly be called mendicant; many of these profess to live on alms alone, after the example of their founder. They are not very importunate beggars, rarely addressing themselves to particular individuals; they, for the most part, are found in crowded streets, shouting out 'Relief for the love of God.' Others of this order become hermits, and profess to support themselves by manual labour."

In concluding, we must express our wishes that Mr. Taylor may present the public with further illustrations of his views with regard to the filiations of the elder Asiatic superstitions, which he has intimated, rather than unfolded, in various parts of his volume. Those views we have not now room to canvass, nor in their present state could we fairly undertake to do so. However, they appear to us abundantly curious and important; and if the author should attempt, as a *pendant* to his history of Mohammedanism, the more difficult task of unveiling the origin and progress of the Buddhist faith, we should be happy, in due time, to compare our opinions with his on the subject of that very interesting inquiry.

THE HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN IRELAND.*

It is much to be feared that the world will never see any thing approaching to an impartial History of Ireland. To expect such a desideratum from an Irishman would be absurd, from an Englishman vain, and from a foreigner hopeless: for even suppose the last was disposed to be impartial, his ignorance of our modes of thinking, acting, and speaking; his mistakes concerning our practices and feelings, would cause him to view every thing through such a refracting and distorting medium that, in spite of himself, he must and would be a partial narrator. But if ever a history, having any approximation towards temperate and well-balanced statements should appear, it must be after writers, acting as the organs of *all* political parties, and *all* religious sects, shall have done their best, or rather worst, in giving to events the hue and aspect they specially desire; and then, perhaps, as white is considered the happy combination of all other colours, so some future historian may arise, who, from the histories of the Milesian, the Anglo-Norman, and the Cromwellian, from the Romanist, the Church-of-England-man, and the Presbyterian—from Keating, O'Halloran, O'Connor, Lanigan and Taaffe; from Curry, Moore, and O'Driscoll; from Carte, Cox, Leland, Warner, Gordon, and though last not least, from such a writer as Mr. Reid, representing the Presbyterian parties in Ireland, may be concocted, if not an impartial, at least a candid, instructive, and comprehensive History of Ireland.

Mr. Reid's history, would, as it ought, have had long ago a notice in the *CHRISTIAN EXAMINER*, were it not that we were anxious to see the *whole* of what he had to say, and therefore awaited the forthcoming of his *second* volume. But desirous as we are to give him every encouragement, and supposing that even our humble praise, our humble recommendation may help to stimulate him towards the speedy production of his second volume, we have no hesitation in asserting that we know of no History of Ireland that exhibits so much research—so much industry, combined with good temper and sound Christian views, as the volume before us. With a style plain and unambitious, it

* The History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, comprising the Civil History of the Province of Ulster, from the accession of James the First: with a Preliminary Sketch of the progress of the Reformed Religion in Ireland during the sixteenth century, and an Appendix, consisting of Original Papers. By James Seaton Reid, D.D., Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Carrickfergus.—Waugh and Innes, Edinburgh; William Curry, Jun. and Co. Dublin; W. M'Comb, Belfast; and Whittaker and Co. London. 1834.

gives an entertaining and instructive account of the establishment of Protestantism in the north of Ireland, and of the settlement of Ulster; and to any one who is desirous to obtain information of that glorious and happy providential dispensation, whereby the wilds, the woods, the bogs, and fastnesses of our northern province have become the scene of a great Protestant settlement, the glory of Ireland, and a bulwark that has connected the two islands, forming, as we may say, the moral and military Giant's Causeway, that reaches from one shore to the other, and links the three kingdoms into an empire, this work will prove a valuable acquisition. Mr. Reid thus gives his reasons for writing, and they are just ones:

"The first attempt towards filling up a chasm, which has long existed in the ecclesiastical history of the empire. While the origin and progress of the churches of England and of Scotland, of the Puritans, Baptists, Quakers, and almost every other denomination, have been fully and frequently traced, it is singular that no history has yet appeared of any branch of the Protestant church in Ireland. Of this church, the Presbyterians have long formed an extensive and influential section, and have, at the same time, possessed many strong claims upon the notice of the historian. Their history is so intimately connected with all the more important changes in the civil affairs of Great Britain during the last two centuries, and the cause of constitutional freedom is so much indebted to their noble efforts at the Revolution—they have been planted in the north of Ireland for so long a period, and have passed through so many interesting vicissitudes, both as a church and people—their settlement in Ulster, where they constitute the large majority of the population, has rendered that province so remarkable a contrast, in point of wealth, intelligence, and tranquillity, to the other parts of the empire—they occupy so singular and anomalous a position, a non-conforming, yet an endowed church—and they have been so generally characterised by probity, peaceableness, and industry, as well as firm and enlightened attachment to the principles of civil and religious liberty; that while it is surprising these peculiarities in their condition have not long ago led to an inquiry into their history, it is, at the same time, far from being creditable to ourselves that our forefathers' services and sufferings should have remained so long unrecorded."

Mr. Reid, as is usual with historians, bespeaks for himself the character of impartiality and temperate dealing, with respect to parties and sects opposed to Presbyterianism, as follows:

"From the nature of the following work, I could not avoid noticing the character and procedure of other churches in Ireland. But while I have expressed myself without reserve on these subjects, and have neither disguised the principles nor repressed the feelings of a conscientious Presbyterian, I am not aware of having unnecessarily obtruded my sentiments, or employed language which ought to be offensive to those who cannot adopt my views. My 'plainness of speech' may provoke and irritate the bigot;

but it will not annoy or displease the candid reader, how widely soever he may differ from me in political or religious matters. I have exposed corruption and error, and reprobated intolerance and persecution, with unreserved freedom, wherever they were displayed; but assuredly, with no hostile feelings towards the adherents of the churches whose conduct may have been censured; and certainly under no political prejudice against any one class of my countrymen, nor with the remotest intention of implicating the present generation, either of Romanists or Protestants, in the guilt of former transactions. While I have 'nothing extenuated,' I can sincerely say, I have not 'set down aught in malice;' and though 'not afraid to blame,' the awarding of praise to all parties, had the truth of history permitted, would have been to me a much more congenial occupation."

Whether he deserves what he assumes, we shall not, for the present, express an opinion, desiring, as we do, to reserve our observations on this subject for the review of his second volume; for the present being content to observe, that though in some respects we think he leans rather hard on our church, and certain of our churchmen, we do not observe any of that rancorous soreness, that fretting malignity that some churchmen suppose go to the composition of that politico-religious monster, 'a black-mouthed Presbyterian.'

Mr. Reid's volume, which reaches but to the commencement of the rebellion of 1641, and contains 450 honest goodly octavo pages, might, if he had confined himself to the mere story of the Presbyterian Church, have been sweated down (to use the coiners' and clippers' phrase) to a slender duodecimo; but then, if submitted to such an alchemy, it would not certainly deserve its present currency, and would have its present value in our eyes very much diminished. In fact, we prize it as we do because it is so discursive, because it is so anecdotal, because the story of Protestantism is so full of portraits and individualities, that we love, in escaping from the vapid and tame generalities of Leland and Warner, from their mawkish liberality, and cold, incurious story, to mingle and identify ourselves with the Hamiltons and Montgomerys, the Brices, Levingstones, and Blairs; with the Ushers, Bedells, and Knoxes, of those times when men lived under the fervour and not the lukewarmness of religion, and when the sanctions of the eternal world were brought to bear so effectively, and directing the thoughts and actions of politicians as well as ecclesiastics.

As we have just observed, Mr. Reid has undertaken more than his title-page warrants; and in his liberality has given us a very ample and well-digested preliminary account of the religious state of Ireland before and at the period of the Reformation. For the present it is our intention to confine ourselves to the introductory chapters, because we desire to take advantage of this well-digested and well-told narrative, to show what were the effects of Popery when, without a rival, and with all

power, it discharged its function of teaching religion and morality to Irishmen. It would appear that whoever first introduced Christianity into our Western Isle, promulgated nothing which the primitive church has not held as catholic and apostolic verities. In the confession of faith attributed to St. Patrick, and which undoubtedly is a very ancient document, we find nothing which the Protestant and restored Church of Ireland does not at present hold; we find the doctrines of free grace in it and other ancient writings, inculcated, and the efficacy of the sacrifice and intercession of Christ. We look in vain for transubstantiation; for the worship of saints; for the dependence on human merit; and so far from a purgatorial state being believed in, we find it expressly stated that there are but three places, *tres habitacula*, or states of existence, earth, heaven, and hell; we find Papal domination renounced, and resisted; the marriage of the clergy allowed; the Holy Scriptures extolled as the rule of faith and living, and as such recommended to the use and edification of all, whether lay or clerical; we find colleges, as for instance, Clonard, and Lismore, Ardagh, &c. &c., where St. Finian and other holy men lectured on the Sacred Volume to all students, whether lay or clerical; and we find men instructed in these sacred seminaries going forth over Christendom, with the gospel in their hands, and not the Breviary, to teach and preach to Aliman and Frank, to Lombard, Saxon, and Burgundian, the unsearchable riches of Christ. But when in latter ages, and when the Church of Ireland began to correspond with and to approximate to the Church of Rome, we find that she not only partook of the cup of her abomination in doctrine, but as a sure consequent, she also drank of the dregs of her moral degradation; deplorably ignorant, ferociously turbulent, giving the rein to every erring passion, and every lust, the Irish nation present the extraordinary, but revolting picture of a country teeming with churchmen, bishops, and conurbans, abbots, and erinachs, monks, nuns, and anchorites, friars, black and grey, with all their trumpery.

In fact, as some have stated, half the male population were clerics in some form or office; and yet what effect had all this *materiel* on the character and conduct of the nation? Why, let Peter Walsh, the Franciscan friar, speak. In his Prospect of Ireland, after quoting the following description of the morals and manners of Ireland in the 12th century, given by St. Bernard, in his life of Malachy:

“ He (Malachy) was not sent to men, but to beasts; no where did he observe people so stubborn as to manners, so bestial as to rites, so impious as to faith, so headstrong as to discipline, so filthy as to life—Christians by name, but in very deed Pagans.”

Walsh observes:

“ Whether this most hideous corruption of manners might not evince a

very just ground to suspect even a great apostacy among the clergy themselves in some places, and by consequence a much greater among the people in the same places, I must confess I know not what to answer to these queries."

The Franciscan thus narrates a specialty of misdoing, which he not unjustly infers may have brought down the vengeance of heaven on the Irish nation, and that was their being slave-dealers to a large extent; and thus we find that Ireland, in spite of its saints, was the last place in Christendom where, in spite of the merciful genius of the religion of the cross, the traffic in human flesh was upheld; and thus the most priest-ridden people of the middle ages were the last to give over the ancient slavery inherited from Paganism; and the most priest-ridden people in modern Europe (the Spaniards) were, under the instigation of bishops and friars, the first to take it up, and regraft it on the Christian character.

In arriving at historical truth, with respect to the effect of the prodigious religious machinery of ancient Ireland on the character of its people, we can only proceed sideways, and by catching at incidental admissions. We must recollect that all the writers of the time were ecclesiastics, ready at all times to magnify their office, and varnish over the deeds of their powerful corporation. It is, therefore, only when Bernard wanted to place the character of his friend Malachy, Bishop of Armagh, in contrast with the simoniacal and dissolute prelates of his day, that we have the truth oozing out concerning the state of the clergy. It is only when Surins is zealous to magnify St. Lawrence O'Tool, Archbishop of Dublin, that we find him let out the astounding fact, that 150 priests in that archdiocese were, in one batch, sent to Rome, by that stern disciplinarian, to do penance for their incontinency.

To the national rivalry between the newly arrived English clergy and the Irish churchmen we likewise are indebted for a knowledge of some curious facts. At a synod held in Christ's Church, Dublin, by Comyn, the successor of Lawrence O'Tool in that see, Gerrald Barry, a Welch ecclesiastic, as notorious for his self-sufficiency as for his talents, and who has written, as most Englishmen have done concerning Ireland, partly offensively and from hearsay—he, on occasion of preaching before the synod, taxed the Milesian clergy with the vice of drunkenness, and rated their bishops with a neglect of their pastoral charge—with abstaining altogether from preaching to the people, either in the way of instruction or reproof, and with a total disuse of that Episcopal discipline which might restrain their vices, or plant the seeds of virtue and godly living. Incensed at this set down, Albin O'Mollony, the Abbot of Baltinglass, on the following day, mounted the pulpit, and, instead of denying the charge made on the Irish, he shifted ground, and retaliated on the English priests, and pronounced, with all the fervour of an indignant and nationally offended orator, that the Irish had vitiated their probity and innocence from the example of the newly arrived Eng-

lish; and not content with a mere statement in general, the angry abbot, on descending from the pulpit, instituted a formal accusation, supported by witnesses, against the English clergy of the town of Wexford, for cohabiting *publicly* with harlots. The Archbishop, though a Briton, could not withstand the weight of evidence adduced; so the evildoers were sentenced to suspension, to the infinite triumph and amidst the loud laughter of the Irish clergy. Now, with respect to the above facts, bearing on the character of those to whom was committed the religious instruction of the people, it must be observed that if Albin O'Mollony was right, and the Irish took the tone and tenor of their lives from their English invaders, they must have been very apt scholars in their new and evil way, and have no small propensity profligacy, when, in ten or twelve years at farthest, the Irish should have been instructed and ripe practitioners in all that was so abominable.

But that the Irish clergy, at this period, were a base, degraded, unpatriotic crew, who allowed the Pope, without a remonstrance, first of all to abuse their country, and then to sell it, not for a piece of silver, but for brass pennies, to King Henry, there is no doubt; and, though Lorian or Lawrence O'Tool is considered as a patriot and a saint by the Irish, yet we find him accepting his pall from the pontiff who had transferred his country to a foreigner, and had stigmatized its people as so barbarous that they required the Anglo-Norman rule to recover them from their filthy life, unsound doctrine, and abominable conversation.

Whether the Irish clergy, who, with Lawrence O'Tool, of Dublin, and Catholicus and Donough, Archbishops of Tuam and Cashel, at their head, ratified the Pope's sale and settlement of Ireland on Henry, were the better for coming into still closer communion with the see of Rome, it will now be our business to show; and here we find Mr. Reid most opportunely at hand, and we have nothing to do but quote largely what he so luminously states:

"The authority of the Roman pontiff and his degenerate church, reigned supreme, as well over a bigoted and obsequious priesthood, as an ignorant and enslaved people; while the political circumstances of the country aggravated the evils which had universally resulted from such an uncontrolled and unscriptural jurisdiction.

"The turbulent state of the island, and its remoteness from the seat of government, prevented the British monarch from exercising with effect that control which he claimed over the appointment of prelates to the Irish sees. These dignities were almost invariably bestowed by the Pope, without the reference to the King required in the sister kingdoms, either for his previous license or his subsequent approbation. When a vacant see lay contiguous to the English Pale,* or promised to be a lucrative preferment,

* The Pale included the few counties immediately contiguous to Dublin, where the English first settled. This district was more or less extensive,

the interposition of the sovereign was occasionally entreated by a rival candidate, and the paramount claims of the Pope, though after much contention, were as often overthrown. But this salutary check was seldom exercised; and the Roman pontiff was permitted to fill all the influential offices in the church, and not unfrequently in the state, with the most obsequious of his adherents. The ready communication which, by way of France and Spain, existed between Ireland and the court of Rome, by facilitating the carrying of appeals thither, and the procuring thence of indulgences and other expensive articles of papal manufacture, contributed still further to extend and increase the power of that court, and proportionably to oppress and impoverish the people.

"The prelates, therefore, were entirely devoted to the interests of the mother-church, on which they were so dependent, and with which they possessed such facilities of intercourse. In other countries, allegiance to the sovereign generally counteracted, if it did not supersede, this unqualified subservience to the authority of the Pope; but the royal power was too weak in Ireland to oppose with success the continued extension of ecclesiastical domination. Accordingly, the bishops carried the authority of the church, and the privileges of their order, to an extravagant and intolerable height. They spared neither king nor people. The encroachments on the rights of the crown occasionally roused the indignation of the sovereign;* but owing to the troubled state of the kingdom, and the weakness of the royal authority, these were generally unnoticed. They filled the chief offices in the civil government of the kingdom, in which they were often guilty of shameless fraud and oppression.† They arrogantly claimed that

according as they were more or less successful in their incursions on the neighbouring septa. It included the counties of Dublin, Kildare, Meath, with part of Louth, and occasionally extended as far northward as Newry.

* Ware's Works, i. 199. The curious case here related between the Bishop of Down and Edward I., clearly evinces the usurpation of the clergy in the beginning of the fifteenth century. The king called him to account, 1st, for excluding, in conjunction with the primate, all clerks born in England from the monasteries within his diocese; 2d, for exercising in his manors all the pleas of the crown except four; 3d, for claiming the *eric*, or ransom, for killing a mere Irishman, or committing felony within his jurisdiction. After he had been deprived of these exorbitant encroachments, he was again brought under censure for breaking into the convent at Down, stealing thence the king's letter of license to the prior, &c., to elect a new abbot, and then forcibly advancing one of his own creatures to that dignity.

† Ware, i. 331. Bicknor, archbishop of Dublin in the fourteenth century, was lord treasurer of Ireland for many years. He was excommunicated by the Pope, at the instigation of Edward II., for refusing to give any account of his administration of the public revenues. The sentence, however, was pronounced merely *pro forma*, to satisfy the king; and the delinquent was permitted to join in the performance of divine service at Rome, whilst under its operation; dishonesty being, in the opinion of his holiness, no very flagrant crime. The archbishop was afterwards pardoned for sundry false writs and acquittances which he had fraudulently inserted

their persons should be exempted from arrest for debt; * and their properties from being taxed without their own consent. On one occasion, the prelates of an entire province threatened to depose their clergy, and to excommunicate the people, because they had, without the special consent of their superiors, contributed to a subsidy, laid on by parliament for the exigencies of the state.† They exercised the right of pardoning felons within their dioceses, or of commuting their punishment for money.‡ To increase their influence, they studied to transfer almost every litigated case from the civil to the ecclesiastical tribunals. Their own disputed claims, however, were sometimes adjusted, not by the verdict of the law, but by the chances of single combat, in which bishops did not hesitate to engage by delegated champions.§ The various orders of the clergy, too, were repeatedly encroaching on the privileges of each other, and were frequently embroiled in the most unseemly contentions. Bishops opposed the jurisdiction of their metropolitans;|| and the latter, in their turn, oppressed, and sometimes even openly assaulted their suffragans.¶ The inferior orders

in his account as treasurer; so that when he did render an account of his administration, it had not been a very correct one. The office of lord chancellor was at this time almost exclusively filled by bishops.

* Ware, i. 482. Cox, i. 222. It was not till the year 1529, that this exemption began to be limited. Power was then given, by a provincial synod held at Limerick, to the mayor of that city, to imprison clerical debtors without danger of incurring the sentence of excommunication—the usual penalty for so heinous a sacrilege. ‘The clergy made,’ as might be expected, ‘a grievous outcry against this canon, as an infringement and violation of their ecclesiastical privileges.’

† See this case in Ware, i. 478.

‡ See note 3.

§ Cox, i. 76. Ware, i. 406. A bishop of Ossory, in the year 1284, prosecuted his right to a manor by combat, and gained it, his champion overcoming that of his adversary.

|| Ware, i. 508. The following charges, exhibited against a bishop of Limerick in the latter end of the fourteenth century, will corroborate the above assertion.—‘That when Torrington, the archbishop of Cashel, came to redress the grievances of the Franciscans, and cited this bishop to answer them, he laid violent hands on the archbishop, and tore the citation from him with such force that he drew his blood—that the bishop having been a long time excommunicated for debts due to the apostolic see, paid no regard thereto, but acted as usual—that the archbishop having cited him for heresy, was, together with his attendant clergy, in danger of being assaulted, if he had not run away; and that, after he had retired, the bishop, clothed in his pontificals, entered the city of Limerick, and by bell, book, and candle, publicly excommunicated every person who had supplied the archbishop with food or entertainment.’ See also Ware, i. 528–9, for the turbulent conduct of a Bishop of Waterford towards the Bishop of Lismore and the Archbishop of Cashel.

¶ Ware, i. 533. An Archbishop of Cashel, in the middle of the fourteenth century, assaulted a Bishop of Waterford, by night, in his lodgings, grievously wounded him, and many others who were in his company, and robbed him of his goods. See also Cox, i. 91.

were not less refractory and disputatious than their superiors.* The regular or monastic clergy laboured to undermine the popularity and diminish the dues of the secular or parochial clergy; while the latter inveighed in the bitterest terms against the idleness and profligacy of the mendicant orders.† The clergy of native extraction opposed their English brethren, and did not hesitate to charge them with corrupting the entire clerical order, by the vices which they introduced into the country.‡ To so great a height were these animosities carried, that the king was frequently obliged to interfere, in order to secure admission for his countrymen into vacant benefices in the Irish church.¶ They who thus invaded the rights of the sovereign and of each other, could not be expected to be very scrupulous in their encroachments on those of the laity. The people, indeed, were the victims of unmitigated oppression; and both their persons and their properties were treated by the priesthood, as if placed at their absolute disposal.

The wealth of the Irish clergy, the chief cause and evidence of their corruption,§ was not so exorbitant as in Britain, in consequence of the general poverty of the kingdom. The devastations occasioned by the perpetual contests of the native chieftains impoverished the country, and left but little for the priesthood to amass. A northern bishoprick in the fifteenth century was so poor, that no occupant could be found for it during more than twenty years.¶ Several prelates were obliged to have recourse to inferior occupations for support; though, in the mean time, their fees to the Pope were exacted with such unsparing rigour, that even the churches were stripped of their ornaments to satisfy his exorbitant demands.** In proportion, however,

* So late as 1525, a bishop of Leighlin was murdered by his archdeacon, on the high-way, "because he had reproved him for his insolent obstinacy and other crimes, and threatened him with further correction." Ware, i. 461.

† See these contentions related at large, in Ware, i. 82 and 332; ii. 86. Cox, i. 148, and in Mason's *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral*, 133-4. Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh, from 1347 to 1359, was the most vigorous opponent of the mendicants, for which he was charged with heresy, and suffered no little hardship. It is remarkable that the year in which he died, Wycliffe, who was acquainted with his writings, took up the same controversy in England, which was the first occasion that brought this celebrated reformer into prominent notice, and led him to adopt that cardinal principle of Protestantism—the sufficiency of Scripture for all purposes of faith and duty. Bellarmine charges Fitzralph with heresy, and states that Wycliffe derived from the Archbishop's writings several of his alleged errors. Bishop Davenant gives the following, as an opinion of Fitzralph:—"Armachani opinio est, quod si omnes Episcopi essent defuncti sacerdotes minores possent ordinare." Several very interesting particulars in his life may be seen in Anderson's "*Sketches of the Native Irish*," pp. 14-18.

‡ Ware's *Annals*, ad. an. 1185, and *Works*, i. 439.

¶ See the interference of the king, in the case of the Bishop of Down, in note 3. It thence appears that both the primate and he excluded all Englishmen from benefices in their dioceses.

§ It was an old saying and a true one, "*Ecclesia peperit divitias, et filia devoravit matrem.*"

¶ The bishoprick of Dromore. See Ware, i. 188, 263, 408, for similar instances of poverty.

** Cox, i. 61. A. D. 1229. "Now came over Stephen, the Pope's chaplain, to demand the tenth of all moveables, to support the Holy See against the

to the general poverty that prevailed, the clergy became the more rapacious and oppressive. The most unjustifiable measures were employed to increase their revenues. In the thirteenth century, an Archbishop of Dublin destroyed in the fire all the leases which his tenants, at his own order, had laid before him, and by which alone they held their respective properties, that he might, by this iniquitous procedure, the more readily augment his income.* One of his successors, in the same century, laid the metropolis under an interdict, because the mayor and citizens had attempted to limit the exactions of his clergy, and to subject their offerings to the priests to certain reasonable regulations.† In addition to their stated support derived from tithes, which were rigorously exacted, numerous other expedients for amassing wealth were adopted. Ecclesiastical censures were commuted for money. Penances were liberally enjoined, that they might be superseded by extravagant fines. Fixed dues were demanded for almost every religious office performed; indulgences were regularly set up to sale, and every opportunity of extorting money was eagerly embraced.‡ In favourable situations, therefore, the prelates and inferior clergy shared among them much of the wealth of the country, a very small proportion of which was consecrated to the advancement of useful learning or the encouragement of education among the people.

Learning, which had formerly flourished in Ireland to a considerable extent, was now reduced to a very low ebb. The want of colleges contributed materially to this national degeneracy. The higher orders of the clergy were generally educated at Oxford, and a large proportion at Paris, and other places on the Continent, and a few of these were undoubtedly men of considerable attainments and extensive erudition. But the priesthood were content with the scanty instructions which they received at cathedral or collegiate churches, and which scarcely fitted them for the celebration of divine service.§ Attempts had been frequently made to establish colleges at Dublin, Drogheda, and Armagh; but after a brief existence, they were soon abandoned through want of that fostering patronage which wealthy prelates might have afforded. The numerous monasteries that were scattered through the island scarcely relieved the general gloom. The knowledge

Emperor Frederick. It was so hard a tax in Ireland that they were fain to part with not only their *cadows* and *aquavits*, but also with their chalices and their altar-clothes." See also *ibid.* p. 75. *Cadows* were the Irish mantles, the chief article of dress.

* Ware, i. 319-20.

† Ware, i. 322-3.

‡ I may mention, as an instance of prelatical rapacity, the rigour with which archbishops levied from the heirs of their suffragan bishops, some of their most valuable possessions which they claimed as heriots due them. In the fifteenth century an Archbishop of Armagh prosecuted this claim on the heirs of two of his suffragans, for their best horse, ring cup. Ware i. 185, 253.

§ See, in a subsequent part of this introduction, the descriptions given by Archbishop Brown and Sir Henry Sydney, of the wretched ignorance of the inferior orders of the clergy even in their times.

existing among their indolent inmates was confined to the dreams of martyrology, the subtleties of the canon law, or the conceits of scholastic theology. Hence the works which were produced in Ireland during the two or three centuries preceding the Reformation, so far as they are known, were both few in number and trifling in matter. Their authors were almost exclusively ecclesiastical, yet scarcely any of their writings had reference to the sacred volume, or tended to advance the knowledge or promote the practice of religion. The lives of imaginary saints, and the compilation of fabulous annals—commentaries on the works of the scholastic doctors, and poems in honour of deceased prelates, composed the principal part of their writings.*

We shall conclude, for the present number, our review of the Ecclesiastical State of Ireland before the Reformation. In the following number we purpose to take up the subject, and, with the help of Mr. Reid, and perhaps others, show what effect this degraded state of the clergy had on their own morals and that of the hapless people who formed the flock of such shepherds.

* See Ware's writers during the centuries above mentioned. I may here observe, that I have searched in vain for any satisfactory notices of the contents of the monastic or cathedral libraries in Ireland, immediately prior to the Reformation. The following are the only gleanings I have met with. 1305. An Archbishop of Armagh bequeathed several books to the church there. Ware, i. 71.—1369. A southern chieftain is obliged to restore to the church of Limerick, among other things, the books which he had taken from it. Cox, i. 129.—1438. Mr. Martin White, Rector of Liscarton, left to the monastery of Navan a book of the decretals and a small Bible. Monast. Hiber. 559.—1483. An Archbishop of Dublin left to the abbey of Osney a portiforium (probably a liturgical book), the mass-book, a book called "*Pupilla Oculi*," and two books of physic. Ware, i. 343.—1500. Dean Alleyne bequeathed to Christ Church, Dublin, the works of Panormitan (a celebrated canonist) with the great repertory thereon; also the great repertory of Philip, Bishop of Brescia. Mason's St. Patrick, 142.

KNOX AND JEBB'S CORRESPONDENCE.*

THE task of a reviewer is often an ungracious one as it regards others, and a painful one to his own feelings. We feel this the case in sitting down to review the Correspondence between Bishop Jebb and Alexander Knox. We have those kindly recollections of by-gone days—of hours of instruction and interesting communication, that we feel pained at sitting in judgment, where we cannot give unqualified praise—where we must express opinions upon sentiments put forward that may seem at variance with the unfeigned affection we have always entertained towards their authors; and yet this correspondence is too intimately connected with the theology and literature of our own country especially, for us consistently with our duty towards our subscribers and friends to pass it by in silence. We feel forced to enter on the task, and only trust that we shall be enabled to perform it in a spirit of fidelity to the cause of truth, and yet tenderness and kindness to the amiable and highly gifted individuals whose private letters are here given to the public. We feel an especial degree of pain in being forced to comment upon the matter which we find in this correspondence, from the very circumstance that the authors have passed off the stage. We could have had less unpleasant feeling in pointing out what appeared to be errors in their views, if they were alive to explain, to defend, to reply—if they were alive when their letters were given to the public, and when, by the act of publication, they challenged criticism and courted fair and open judgment. But when they are no more who could defend—when they have passed away who could have prevented wholly the publication, or could have exercised their sound discretion in the selection of letters for publication, we do feel particularly distressed in being obliged to act the part of censors.

There is one person connected with this publication towards whom we entertain no feelings of delicacy, and of whose little but still important part in the transaction we are disposed to speak with stern truth, and that is the editor. We think him highly to be blamed for throwing before the public, letters which passed in the most perfect confidence of private friendship, without the most complete assurance that the authors and their friends would have wished them to be seen in the state in which they

* *Thirty Years' Correspondence, between John Jebb, D.D. F.R.S., Bishop of Limerick, Ardfer, and Aghadoe, and Alexander Knox, Esq. M.R.I.A. Edited by the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D., Perpetual Curate of Ash next Sandwich: formerly Domestic Chaplain to Bishop Jebb.—London: James Duncan, 37, Paternoster-row; and John Cochran, 108, Strand. 1834.*

are published. It is true that Mr. Forster tells us that Bishop Jebb, confided the manuscripts, not many months before his departure hence, to his care in the following words: "These volumes are yours, and remember the correspondence is to be given to the world."

But, admitting this to have been the case, Mr. Forster should have considered (and the public will consider) that Bishop Jebb was at that time weakened by disease, and incapable of exercising that discriminating judgment which he would have exhibited some years before; but there were others to be considered besides Bishop Jebb; there was the memory of Mr. Knox, and the respective friends of both, those who valued them whilst living, and can feel pain at any wound inflicted upon them when dead. If not the memory of the dead, surely the feelings of the living should have been consulted, and not sacrificed to Mr. Forster's vanity of being the editor of the *Correspondence of Bishop Jebb and Alexander Knox*. But suppose he thought himself bound to give the correspondence to the world, he clearly did not think himself bound to give it all, without selection, as it came into his hands. No; he has evidently made a selection; he has left many a gap; he has omitted many a letter; it would be hard to say upon what grounds, which would not have led him to omit many more. In reading, we could not help asking, why is not this left out? Why this put in? Why so large a portion of these large high-priced volumes filled with the hypocondriac complaints of two sickly valetudinarians—so much of the east wind and the north wind, and their several effects upon their morbid constitutions? This might all do very well between two bachelor friends, but why tell it for them to the world? There has been selection, but yet as little judgment in the selection as it is possible to conceive. We never read a book that made us more earnestly say, defend me from my friends! But we must introduce our readers to the *Correspondence* itself, out of which we shall extract some passages which delight and please us—which give us gratifying pictures of the friends that are gone; but we shall be obliged, in candour, to point out others which pain and grieve us, and against the sentiments of which we must ever raise our voice. And it is one of the melancholy features of the *Correspondence*, that the earliest letters are those in which we find the most affectionate and simple piety—not only more warmth, but more truth. The correspondence opens with Mr. Jebb's getting the curacy of Swanlinbar, in the diocese of Kilmore, through the recommendation of Mr. Knox. Our first extract shall be from Mr. Jebb's fourth letter, dated Swanlinbar, December 31, 1800. It exhibits the genuine simple piety of a young Christian, and shows him delighting in the correspondence of the excellent Dr. Stopford, whose just and correct evangelical views of divine truth, it would have been indeed well if Mr. Jebb had followed, instead of having been led away from the simplicity of the Gospel, by the enticing philosophy of Mr. Knox.

"Since I last wrote to you, I have experienced much pleasure, and derived no small advantage, from a correspondence, which has been pretty briskly carried on, between Stopford, of the College, and me. Every letter that he writes is calculated to make him who receives it a better Christian. He abounds in truly ardent zeal; his simplicity, humility, and benevolence are most edifying; he has a charitable and friendly feeling for Christians of all denominations; and it his supreme wish to promote piety in sentiment and practice, and the knowledge of gospel truth. I am not without sanguine hopes of his exertions and example having a happy influence on the minds and habits of young students (he is lecturer in divinity): if they only follow his advice, they will become exemplary clergymen. And I think it nearly impossible that many of them should not imbibe some of his spirit, and be warmed by a portion of his zeal.

"My present study is the Bible, without any commentary: the object, to acquire a general view of God's dispensations. After having gone through the Sacred Volume, I purpose reading general views of Scripture; and then applying the information acquired from them; reading over the Bible again; reviewing my remarks, and looking at the queries put down; for I do not now stop to investigate minute difficulties. For all this, I allow about a year. And then, with God's help, having formed some ideas for myself, I propose to enter on a plan of general study, in which divinity shall be the grand object, and all the branches shall be subordinate.

"Correspondence on religious topics, I believe, would be extremely useful. Stopford says, he has found it of singular service; and strongly recommends it to me. His letters are a great treasure. I find in them a powerful stimulus to exertion; and, at the same time, a serious call to humility. They unite, in an uncommon degree, fervour, and a sense of man's weakness in himself. They have created in me some new feelings. And I heartily implore God's grace, that I may improve by them as I ought.

"Whenever you can conveniently write, I would be particularly obliged to you for your advice; whether as to study, or practice, or methods of improving my religious feelings.

"I should be very thankful for a few ideas on what *Christian* preaching should be: it is a complaint with many, and I believe in some measure just, that clergymen do not sufficiently preach the peculiar doctrines of our religion. What do you conceive to be the mean between cold morality and wild enthusiasm, in preaching?"

This inquiry, as to the nature of Christian preaching, produced a letter of Mr. Knox's, which occupies twenty pages, and which we should be glad if we could present entire to our readers. It represents Mr. Knox's views of divine truth in their best form. In his advanced years, as far as this correspondence at least is concerned, he never put forward any thing that contained so much scriptural truth; at the same time, it appears to us to have its defect, a serious defect, which after life never supplied, but which became more systematically visible in all his after productions.

"Shrewsbury, Jan. 29, 1801.

"MY DEAR MR. JEBB,—I thank you much for your last letter: I sat down to answer it, several days ago; but I began, on a larger scale than I was able to accomplish: I must, therefore, be content to take in my sails; not, as is customary, because there is too much wind, . . . but, because there is not enough to fill them.

"What you say of Stopford is just in every respect: he is an uncommonly good man; and you cannot do better than keep up a correspondence with him. The grand deficiencies in right temper and conduct arise much more from want of right feelings, than from want of knowledge: and right feelings cannot so certainly be either obtained or improved, as by communication and close intercourse with those who possess them. 'As iron sharpeneth iron, so doth the countenance of a man his friend:' Solomon said some true things; and this is not the least important of them.

"You say, that 'it is nearly impossible that many of those who attend Stopford's divinity lectures should not imbibe some of his spirit, and be warmed by a portion of his zeal.' It is, indeed, impossible. True religion is happily contagious: and, I am sure, it owed its rapid progress, in the early ages of the church, infinitely more to the divine infection (if I may use such an expression) that attended the spirit of the Apostles, than to the demonstrative evidence of their miracles. I believe there never yet was a really good man—I mean a zealous, decided Christian—whose lively expression of his own feelings did not, more or less, reach the hearts of those who heard him.

"And this, in some degree, answers your question, 'What Christian preaching should be?' At least, it points out an indispensable pre-requisite: Christian preaching can arise only from a Christian mind and heart. This is the great want in the preaching of today: there is no spirit in it. It is the result of a kind of intellectual pumping; there is no gushing from the spring. Our Saviour, speaking to the woman of Samaria, of the happiness which his religion would bring into the bosoms of those who cordially embraced it, elegantly and expressively represents it by a well of water in the breast, 'springing up into everlasting life.' Where this is in a minister, it will spring out, as well as spring up: and it will be felt to be living water, from the pleasure and refreshment which it conveys, almost even to minds hitherto unaccustomed to such communications.

* * * * *

"Now this, I repeat, (for the reasons above given,) is most surely to be sought in the New Testament itself. And the representation given of Christianity there, differs, in my mind, from that given, in most pulpits, in very many and very important instances. I shall notice two instances particularly:

"I. Christianity is represented, in most pulpits, rather as a scheme of external conduct, than as an inward principle of moral happiness and moral rectitude.

"In modern sermons, you get a great many admonitions and directions, as to *right conduct*; but what David asked for so earnestly, is seldom touched

upon,...' Create in me a CLEAN HEART, O God! and renew a RIGHT SPIRIT within me.' Now, the New Testament dwells on this as its main object: 'Make the tree good,' says Christ, 'and its fruit will also be good.' 'Except ye be converted, and become as little children, you can in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.'

"These expressions evidently imply that, in order to be Christians, persons must undergo a moral change; that Christianity is designed to make them something which they are not by nature; and that the alteration produced in the mind, the affections, and the conduct, by a right and full acquiescence in the Gospel, is so radical, so striking, and so efficacious, as to warrant the strongest imagery, in order to do it justice, that language can furnish.

" 'Except a man,' says our Lord, 'be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' 'If any man,' says St. Paul, 'be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new.' 'If ye, then, be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above: for ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.' 'Being justified by faith, we have peace with God, by our Lord Jesus Christ; for the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us.' And, to quote but one passage more from St. Paul, 'They that are Christ's, have crucified the flesh, with the affections and desires.'

"With these passages of Scripture, then, and many similar ones—nay, with the whole tenor of the New Testament in my view, I hesitate not to say, that Christian preaching consists, first, in representing man to be, by nature, (I mean in his present fallen state,) a weak, ignorant, sinful, and, of course, miserable being; as such, to be liable to God's displeasure; and to be absolutely incapable of enjoying any real happiness, either here or hereafter. The passages of Scripture which prove this are innumerable: I shall give but a few. 'You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins. The carnal mind is enmity against God. The carnal man knoweth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them; because they are spiritually discerned. They that are in the flesh cannot please God. Having the understanding darkened; being alienated from the life of God.'

"The very word for REPENTANCE points out the reality, and depth of this change: *μετανοια*, a transformation of mind. And our Lord's words to St. Paul clearly explain wherein that change, that *μετανοια*, consists: 'To open their eyes; to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God;' that is, to enlighten them with a divine and saving knowledge of what is true and good; to fill their hearts with the love of it; and to furnish them with the power to perform it. The blessings consequent upon this change immediately follow: 'That they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified, through faith that is in ME.'

"Christianity, then, in this view, is really what St. Paul calls it—THE POWER OF GOD UNTO SALVATION. When thus pursued—I mean when a deep

sense of inward depravity and weakness excites a man to seek divine knowledge and divine grace, in order to the enlightening of his mind, and the renewing of his heart—when this view produces conscientious watchfulness, excites to fervent, habitual devotion, and presents to the mind, in a new light, God's inestimable love, in the redemption of the world by HIS Son—then, by degrees, sometimes more rapidly, sometimes more slowly, the true Christian character begins to form itself in the mind. Then, the great things spoken of Christianity in the New Testament begin to be understood, because they begin to be felt. The vanity of earthly things becomes more and more apparent; that divine faith, which gives victory over the world, begins to operate; religious duties, once burthensome, become delightful; self-government becomes natural and easy; reverential love to God, and gratitude to the Redeemer, producing humility, meekness, active, unbounded benevolence, grow into habitual principles; private prayer is cultivated, not merely as a duty, but as the most delightful exercise of the mind; cheerfulness reigns within, and diffuses its sweet influence over the whole conversation and conduct; all the innocent, natural enjoyments of life (scarcely, perhaps, tasted before, from the natural relish of the mind being blunted by artificial pleasures) become inexhaustible sources of comfort; and the close of life is contemplated as the end of all pain, and the commencement of perfect, everlasting felicity.

"This, then, I conceive, is a faint sketch of that state of mind, to which the Christian preacher should labour to bring himself and his hearers. This I take to be 'true religion;' our Saviour's 'well of water springing up into everlasting life;' St. Paul's 'new creature,' and 'spiritual mind;' and St. John's 'fellowship with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ.'

"These points, therefore, I take to be the great features of Christian preaching:

"1. The danger and misery of an unrenewed, unregenerate state, whether it be of the more gross, or of the more decent kind.

"2. The absolute necessity of an inward change: a moral transformation of mind and spirit.

"3. The important and happy effects which take place when this change is really produced.

"But how little justice have I done the subject! what a meagre outline have I given you! But if it sets you on thinking for yourself, and leads you, like the Bereans, to search the Scriptures, 'whether these things be so,' it is the utmost I can look for."

We are sorry that of this long and important letter we can give only extracts. There is much that is excellent in it—much well thought and happily expressed. We must, however, notice a very important defect. It is the more necessary to call attention to this defect, because that which only looks like omission in this letter, we shall see absolutely denied in subsequent parts of the correspondence, and that is the doctrine of justification, pardon of sin, forgiveness of guilt, peace through the atoning blood of Christ, received by faith in that sacrifice. This holds not the

place in the preaching recommended by Mr. Knox which we conceive it holds in the preaching of Paul, and in the preaching of those who follow Paul. There is not found Paul's comfortable doctrine, Rom. v. i. "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ." This radical defect appears here at the beginning. It might be considered as an unintentional omission, but that this very error assumed afterwards a characteristic feature of the school in theology of which Mr. Knox would have wished to be a founder; and what we now regret to find left out, we shall afterwards find denied and argued against. This was, indeed, as will appear, the radical evil of the system of Mr. Jebb and Mr. Knox, and led to that decay and lifelessness which, as we proceed, we shall have occasion to deplore. In the early part of the Correspondence we with pleasure meet with much life. In page 34, we find Mr. Jebb giving an account of his having commenced an expository lecture in the evenings of Sunday, and asking Mr. Knox for any ideas which might occur to him on the subject of lecturing; and, in reply, we find the following letter from Mr. Knox, in which there are beautiful things on the subject of the Scriptures:

"I yesterday dined with our Archbishop. I mentioned to his Grace your having asked my opinion about your course of lectures; and he expressed his wish that you should particularly apply yourself to the preparing youth for confirmation: and gave, I thought, as a reason, his purpose of setting you on that employment, when you should go to Cashel. I answered, that both were very compatible; that I did not question the importance of what he mentioned, but that I consider the lectures, also as of peculiar moment; and, therefore, could not help hoping you would persevere in your design. He seemed not disposed to differ from me: though I am not sure that he has yet before his mind all the motives for cultivating that particular mode of instruction. I think that if he saw it in the light in which, if I live, I will endeavour to place it to him, he will be more decidedly attached to it. And the epitome of these reasons is simply this—that this alone is *preaching the word of God*. This is bringing the Scriptures forward into the light of day; while the common mode of preaching is but a statement of human sentiments.

"I soberly think, that in the Scriptures themselves there is a clearness, a directness, an energy, a congeniality, with all that is honest, good, and wise, in the human heart; which places them infinitely above every thing else in the world. But these qualities do not show themselves to the superficial reader or hearer. They are too genuine to be ostentatious. They are also, perhaps, so disposed as to require that attention to discover them, which tends to fit the mind for valuing them when found. The treasure was *hid* in a field; but, in fact, '*Pater ipse haud facilem esse viam voluit*,' applies almost to every thing promotive of human improvement: which saying of Virgil's is astonishingly correspondent with that in Genesis, '*In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread*.' In order, therefore, to bring the energies of the Scriptures into action, there must be labour of some—there must be

study. But the inability of the people in general to do this for themselves, is the very foundation of the clerical office. How, then, can this office be so well fulfilled, as in developing these concealed excellencies? How can the time allotted for public instruction be so happily employed as in opening the very words and expressions of Moses and the Prophets, of Christ and his Apostles? If they are to be effected at all, what so fit for the purpose as that which was performed, for this very end, by the very wisdom of God? 'The word of God is quick and powerful,' we are told, 'and sharper than a two-edged sword.' But, I think, modern practice effectually prevents this being either known or felt. For, in my mind, mere reading the Scriptures, without opening them, is but wielding the sword with the scabbard on; and preaching in the usual way is brandishing a weapon of human manufacture (which has neither power nor sharpness) in its room. But to explain the Scriptures themselves; to lead them from clause to clause, and from verse to verse; to show the wise adaptation of the observation to the occasion; to explain the connection, and, by that means, exhibit the innate wisdom of the sacred text; to show the knowledge of the human heart which it implies; the accordance with human conduct, and the matchless conduciveness to real happiness, personal and social, which it displays; and, under such a display, to put it to them, 'Is not this infinite truth? Is not this the way to happiness? Do not your hearts give their testimony to this—that he that doeth these things shall never fall?'—consequently this is the word of God, which if you go on to despise, let your own hearts tell what must be your feelings, when you come to the verge of eternity!—It is only after laying open the Scriptures themselves, that any modest man could speak thus, and yet to speak thus is the only way to rouse the benumbed consciences of men."

There is a very long series of letters on the subject of a sermon to be preached by Mr Jebb, for the Association for Discourtenancing Vice, &c. The first notice of it is in April, 1802. It seems to have occupied the thoughts of Mr. Jebb, and formed the subject of correspondence with Mr. Knox during the remainder of the year. In October, we find Mr. Jebb pleading for more time for this sermon, and hoping that he will not be expected to deliver it before January. We are great enemies to the present habit of preaching, without adequate preparation, to which we attribute much of the want of success that is to be deplored in the ministry of our faithful young men; but really this nine months' preparation for a sermon is quite ridiculous; and, however we may pardon the young minister who is more anxious than he ought to be about his first appearance as a public preacher in the metropolis, we cannot as easily forgive the injudicious editor who exposes his weakness, and gives us so much of his collections from Cicero and Lord Shaftesbury, *cum multis aliis*, to enrich this grand discourse. From one of the many letters upon this subject we quote an extract, which shows Mr. Jebb's early views with regard to the dissemination of the Scriptures—views that spring up naturally in an ingenious and pious mind not yet

turned from the *simplicity* of the Bible by systems of human philosophy:

"According to my present view of the subject, after opening the text, should follow, a proof of the power of Scripture to confer happiness; including a contrasted view of the insufficiency of philosophy; all this as personal as possible; then appeal to the audience whether they have made the proper use of the rich treasure given to them: not sufficient that they should read Scripture—their 'delight must be in the law of the Lord;' if they have experienced this delight, they must be anxious to communicate it to others: let them look around, not merely at the poor, but at the rich, and they will see the want of happiness which prevails; they must labour to bring their friends, &c. to a sense of the supreme efficacy of Scripture; and hence if higher orders in general are made fond of the sacred volume, they will give it to the poor. This is a very rough and very curt view of what I now think on the subject: * but I believe that an arrangement somewhat of this nature is what you would recommend."

We can only say, we are sincerely sorry that Bishop Jebb ever turned away from this his own original unspoiled view of the subject.

We have already said that it is in the early letters in this correspondence that we find sentiments congenial to our own, and to which we are enabled to give our warmest and our most willing praise. We cannot pass by page 103, which gives a sweet specimen of Mr. Knox's spiritual views in his happiest style of expression.

"Yesterday, as I was walking in the streets, I asked myself, 'What is Christianity?' It is, answered my mind, a divine system of spiritual attractions, by which, whosoever gives himself honestly to them, is effectually drawn out of the otherwise invincible entanglements and inextricable intricacies of this dark, miserable, polluting, heart-lacerating world, (the *αιων του κοσμου τούτου*—the *αἰωνία των κοσμοκρατειών, του σαρκοῦ, του αιματος τούτου*); and led forth into what David has described, as '*green pastures beside the still waters*;' or what St. Paul has emphatically called ΖΩΗ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ, LIFE AND PEACE. The truth is, to a person of any sensibility, this world is a wretched place. There is not a step in life where we can be sure of not meeting with some latent, lurking thorn; and when we fall in with those various adventurers described by Lucretius, above—if they are in pursuit they rudely shove us by; if they are in possession of their prize, they despise us in their hearts, and tell us by their looks and manner that they do so. A hard, selfish, thorough-paced mind goes on and cares not; but the sensible, delicate, feeling spirit, is ever pushed to the wall. To such a spirit, then, what

* To this passage the editor has thought fit to append the following note: "Upon maturer consideration, Bishop Jebb's views, respecting the indiscriminate dissemination of the Bible, became materially modified; as may be seen in his '*Sermons on Subjects chiefly Practical*,' at the opening of Sermon viii.; and in the Appendix to that volume, *passim*."

a gentle, blessed relief is afforded by a heart knowledge of Christianity: There is no abatement of feeling; the vivid perception is as great as ever. But the heart and mind are so occupied, so filled, so richly compensated, and so deeply tranquillized, by the pursuit, the contemplation, the confident, affectionate, filial apprehension of God, the scripturally revealed God, Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier; the incarnate God, touched with a feeling of our infirmities; and all this, infinitely harmonising, or rather identifying with the philosophic view of the *first good, first perfect, and first fair*, while it is practically and experimentally evinced by undeniable, invaluable, never-failing influences and effects within: all this together forms such a set-off against, and such a refuge from, the common pains and penalties of mortality, as often makes the naturally vulnerable mind rejoice in its quickness of feeling, because this serves to enhance the preciousness of the blessing.

"Perhaps this view may appear to you too highly coloured. It would be so, were it to be taken as the hourly state of the Christian's mind; but all this, to its extent, is the cloudless, meridian state. Many partial obscurations occur to diminish this clearness. But they only diminish it; the substance still remains. A kind of mental rain and storm may also be often experienced, and the weather-beaten pilgrim may tremble to find himself driven, as he thinks, to the very edge of some dangerous precipice, but he does not fall over. He recovers his footing and his confidence, and in a little time the sky is cleared, and the air becomes calm and genial. Amid all this, however, there is sensible progress; and this variety has its great use. In order that the mind may maintain its victory over sin, it must be kept on the alert by temptation; in order that it may continually look to heaven for strength, it must be made to feel its own entire imbecility; and it is, on the whole, necessary, that nothing here should be perfect, in order to the eternal sabbatism being rightly pursued and habitually anticipated."

This certainly is very beautiful, and very well expressed, and reminds us of some of Mr. Knox's brilliant moments in conversation, of the brilliancy (by the by) of which a person who had not the pleasure of his acquaintance can get no idea by this correspondence. There is throughout only a spark here and there which bears any resemblance to the continued flashes of brilliant wit and illustration, which gave such a charm to his familiar conversation.

Some time before the date of the letter from which our last extract is made, there arose a controversy between Mr. Walker and the Methodists; and Mr. Knox, who was under personal spiritual obligations to Mr. Wesley, and who, in his own views, inclined to the Wesleyan view of doctrine, took up his pen in support of the Methodists, and so committed himself as a champion for Arminianism, or at least some leading points of Arminianism, against Calvinism. This circumstance gave a controversial turn to his subsequent views, and to his mode of expressing himself on religion, whether in conversation or in writing. In both he appeared the antagonist of what he called Calvinism;

and in so doing, in our judgment, he not only omitted, and left out, but opposed and denied, many of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel of Christ. In all this Mr. Jebb followed him. Knox's mind was undoubtedly the stronger of the two. Throughout the correspondence we invariably find him suggesting, and Jebb following. Indeed we scarcely trace anything original in Jebb. We shall not say that his mind was not formed for original thinking; but we must say, that he gave it such a habit of leaning upon Mr. Knox for everything, that if it had the power, it lost it by disuse; and this is one circumstance which detracts much from the interest of this very long correspondence. We can scarcely say that we have two writers. There is none of the interesting play of two original, independent, yet friendly minds, eliciting truth by amicable disagreement, and correcting and improving one another.

When we proceed in our work of review, we shall often have to quote sentiments from which we are forced to dissent in the most unqualified manner: we feel a pleasure, then, to give an extract upon a controverted subject, which, we think, is nearer truth than any thing on that side which we ever read. Mr. Jebb, in a letter dated April 6, 1804, had given Mr. Knox a translation of a passage from Scultetus, which he found affixed to the 6th vol. of the "*Critici Sacri*," which treats of the subject of perfection. We shall not transcribe the passage, though well worth reading, but we shall give Mr. Knox's reply, dated April 10, 1804:

"I thank you for your translation of Scultetus: I think his description would be a very good one, if applied to the confirmed Christian; but, as referred to the perfect Christian, I think it too low. It is, in my mind, an error, to take Old Testament attainments, as indicating the evangelic '*ne plus ultra*.' 'He that is least in the kingdom, is greater than he,' speaks a different language. St. John, in his first Epistle, divides Christians into three gradations—little children, young men, and fathers. The first class '*know the Father*,' and '*their sins are forgiven*.' But the second class are '*strong*,' '*the word of God abideth in them*, and they *have overcome the wicked one*.' This, I conceive, is the gradation, to which Scultetus's view would best apply. I say best, because I see no ground for admitting, that, even in this class, the steadfast purpose of serving God, is often interrupted by lapses; or, that (of necessity) the flesh sometimes rebels against the spirit. '*Lapses*,' and '*rebels*,' are both strong expressions; and seem to me, rather to belong to the lowest class of spiritual Christians, than to that which Saint John denominates, young men, i. e. as I said, (and as I think the description implies,) confirmed Christians. There are abundance of mental irregularities, and also, scintillations of actual pravity, . . . vanity, impatience, self-will, self-complacency, foolish device, . . . and even of grosser evils, (perhaps supposed to have been expelled for ever, but sometimes, at an unlooked for moment, starting up, and so pressing upon the mind, as to show, that they can still give annoyance.) There are, I say, such remains of sin, certainly, in Saint

John's second class; and perhaps, some remains of these remains, in his third: and, therefore, even the highest cannot dare to lay claim to absolute sinlessness. But, even in the confirmed Christian, these disagreeable feelings do not occasion lapses, (if they do, they put the person down a class, i. e. to the worst,) nor are their movements strong enough to be denominated rebellious. When terms are transferred, for illustration's sake, from the external to the moral world, the end is not answered, if strict analogy be not preserved. I object, therefore, to the word rebels; because, we never call that a rebellion, which can be put down by policemen, without its producing an overt-act.

"The views of Scultetus are very tolerable, for the school to which he belonged: but it was a uniform principle with all Calvinists, and, indeed, I believe, with all strict followers of St. Austin, to keep down the Christian moral character; as if its rising too high was inconsistent with the honour of divine grace. The misinterpreted passage in Rom. vii. has stood them in stead: and I doubt not but Scultetus had this distinctly in view, when he spoke of lapses, and rebelling of the wicked flesh, against the spirit. But, you are sensible as I am, that it is most unfairly pressed into this service. I own, too, I cannot like the adding to Saint John's 'sinneth not,' the qualifying term, *habitually*. *Presumptuously*, properly understood, is less exceptionable. But, even that, does not, I conceive, come up to the sense of the apostle. He certainly could, had he seen fit, have limited his own expression. He could have put in, *habitually*, or *presumptuously*, as well as any of his commentators. But that, I think, would not have at all answered his purpose. When he says, 'We know that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not;' he seems to me, to make this assertion. He that is, really and truly, renewed, in the spirit of his mind, by the regenerating grace of Christ, possesses the power of so effectually repressing all wrong motions within, and of resisting or guarding against all temptations from without, that, however sensible he may be of painful perturbations, and humbling deficiencies, it is his privilege to live without bringing actual guilt on his conscience, and without yielding, even by volition, to the sins by which, before, he was led captive; of consequence, without grieving the Holy Spirit, or creating an absolute estrangement, however he may perceive and lament transient obscurations between him and his God.—It is, therefore, in my judgment, Saint John's idea, to assert a privilege which may be lived up to; and doubtless has, and is, and will be, though in too few instances, yet, I firmly believe, in many more, than, from merely looking at the outside of things, one could have an idea of. If any qualification, then, were to be added, I think it should be, *sinneth not of necessity*; that is, need not sin, and will not, if he does full justice to himself: and this, I conceive, corresponds most strictly, with what immediately follows: 'But he that is begotten of God keepeth himself; and that wicked one toucheth him not.' The interposed condition of his 'keeping himself,' evidently points the sense to what he *may* do; not to what he certainly will do; for, though he be begotten, or born of God, he may, or may not, keep himself; and the consequence will be accordingly. And therefore, the Gospel being

a scheme or mercy, of medicine for the sick, as well as of fit nourishment for the convalescent, while the privilege is asserted, and the practicable happy result described, there is also a kind and tender supposition of that infidelity to received grace, which, through the frailty of man's nature, and the dangerous circumstances in which he is placed, is ever and anon occurring (yet not necessarily, nor of course, in all :) and for this, adequate provision is made by this apostle; for instance, 'If any man sin, &c.'; and by Saint Paul Gal. vi. 1, where, by the way, the *ΠΡΟΒΛΗΤΗΝ* (compare 1 Cor. ii. 14, &c. and iii. 1, 2, 3, 4,) appear to me, evidently, to be such as retain and use their privilege (as described above;) such as have kept themselves, and whose safety, it is there strongly intimated, depends upon their still keeping themselves. 'Considering thyself,' &c. So that, on the whole, Saint John's character is that of the true, faithful, uniform child of God; of what every child of God has power to be, but not what every child of God actually is. This view, in my opinion, neither dims the brightness of evangelic morality, on the one hand, nor diminishes the cheering warmth of evangelic mercy, on the other. It holds out the noblest incitement to such Christian grace, till we obtain it; and when we obtain it, to exercise it with alacrity. Since, by doing so, we shall (as St. Peter has it,) 'Be kept through the power of God, as in a garrison:' and enjoy habitually, without intermission, though not without remission, that 'peace of God which passeth all understanding.' Yet it also guards against depressing the weak, or stumbling Christian; since it not only provides for the strengthening of such as do stand, but, also, comforting and helping the weak-hearted; and even for raising such as do fall. If, however, all this were my view only, I could less confidently maintain it; but it is peculiarly that of our friends the Platonists—Lucas having explained and supported it at large, and even of Richard Baxter, as the enclosed extract will, I think, evince. Farewell for the present. I will not burn your MS."

We by no means say that we agree with all that Mr. Knox has said here; but we do think that no one has attempted to defend what we consider the indefensible doctrine of Christian perfection, who has done it with more sobriety, and at the same time, less positive error. He does not lower the moral standard of the Gospel, in order to bring it down to the level of poor weak man; he does not do what his friend and instructor, John Wesley, did—alter the definition of sin, in order that he might defend the possibility of a sinless perfection. We allude to a passage in "J. Wesley's Sermon on Perfection," where he describes sin to be—

"A voluntary transgression of a known law; nay," he introduces an objector, replying, "but all transgressions of the law of God, whether voluntary or involuntary, are sin; for St. John says, all sin is a transgression of the law. True; but he does not say, all transgression of the law is sin. This I deny. Let him prove it that can."

So spake J. Wesley, in maintaining perfection; denying that

all transgression of God's law was sin; maintaining that a man might be transgressing God's law, and yet in a state of sinless perfection !!! But thus said not Alexander Knox.

As it is in the early part of the correspondence that we meet with marks and fruits of unsophisticated simple piety; that we see the warm heart showing its love for that which is good, without the caution and the fears of a freezing philosophy, we cannot help extracting a paragraph of a letter of Mr. Jebb's, in which he expresses his zeal and anxiety to do something for the cause of missions. It required a tutoring which he had not yet received, and which it would have been well for him if he had been for ever left without, to lead him to see evil in endeavouring to preach the Gospel to every creature:

"I lately received, from what quarter I am ignorant, unless it be through my friend Mr Sharp, a printed circular letter, from the Society in London, for Missions to Africa and the East; stating their plans, their progress, and the situation of their finances; and requesting my aid, in procuring donations and subscriptions: suggesting, also, a collection from my congregation. Some few and small subscriptions, I believe, I could procure; but congregation I have next to none. The society, however, seems highly deserving of encouragement and assistance. It occupies the ground hitherto untouched by any other society of the Established Church; and its plans seem to be under the guidance of wisdom and sound discretion. Might not something handsome be done in Dublin? Its inhabitants have been unused to appeals of this nature, from the established pulpit: and the novelty of the subject might, perhaps, make a strong impression. If, indeed, the society is chiefly conducted by what are called Evangelical ministers, &c. in England, a prejudice might hence arise against it; but no such prejudice would arise against it, if a few leading people were interested in its favour. I conceive a charity sermon would raise a handsome sum. Should you approve of the society, and of this hint, and should any leading people coincide with you, there would probably be no want, in Dublin, of fit persons to preach the sermon: or, in the event of any difficulty in that respect, rather than let the scheme fall to the ground, I would endeavour to prepare myself, and so to time my visit to Dublin, as would best suit the purpose. It might, perhaps, not be unserviceable, to give a Dublin congregation a view of missions, which probably has never been presented to them. Preachers on this topic, generally look to the *immediate* introduction of Christianity among the heathen. This object, after centuries of experiment, has been but very partially attained; and hence arises a prejudice against missions in general, as unproductive of good. The prejudice, however, may be met, and perhaps overcome, by placing the matter in a more philosophical light; and representing missions as a preparative process—laying the necessary foundation of civilized habits, &c. &c."

We add Mr. Knox's reply, which appears to have satisfied Mr. Jebb, and quenched all his missionary zeal; though we must confess, we see nothing in it that has power to influence any mind that had not put itself entirely into leading strings; no-

thing that in the least cools our warm zeal for sending the light of the gospel to them that sit in darkness :

"I must now add only one more observation ; the messenger who takes this, being at this moment detained by me. It is relative to the missions. I own I doubt the business altogether. Perhaps it is prejudice, but I have no clear hope of these plans. I suspect even something which I should dislike. It seems to me possible, at least, that the Evangelic clergymen took up their missionary plan because the dissenters and Dr. Haweis had engaged in a similar undertaking, and they thought they ought to be doing something too. They would not (I dare say on just grounds enough) join with them ; but neither, on the other hand, did they think it right to be outdone in zeal. If this was their feeling, I think it not a wise one. *Imitatores servum pecus*, is true in all matters but the *essence* of religion. There, and there only, it is well to be 'followers of those who through faith and patience inherit the promises.' There would be something of worldly policy in such a conduct unworthy of the true Christian principle. Besides, I really think that, in such matters particularly, 'it is not of him that willeth, or of him that runneth ;'—on the contrary—

God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform.

"I have another objection to such plans, because they tend to make religion appear to the world a business of *bustle*, and to have something of a revolutionary character. The quiet Moravian missions, if not effectual, are at least unobjectionable ; for they are heard of at a distance, but make no show at home. In fact, I think over-activity, is the grand malady of the times ; and I think religion will not be benefitted by its votaries catching the contagion. I think the whole missionary plan supposes an efficiency in what are deemed the doctrines of the Gospel, which you and I do not admit. They annex more than we do to annunciation of truth on the one hand, and a reception of it (which they call faith) on the other. But we do not agree with the most of them, perhaps, even in what they call truth ; so that, on the whole, I am much more solicitous to see divine truth thoroughly understood, and received in the love of it at home ; and then, I think we shall be made instruments in God's own way, probably without much scheming, to carry it to other lands."

We do sincerely grieve over such philosophizing as this, and we do lament that it should have had such an influence upon a man so promising as Mr. Jebb was, at this time, and whose natural ease, we might almost say constitutional indolence of character, needed rather a stimulus to greater exertions, than such opiates to lull him more into inactivity and rest.

As this correspondence represents the two writers as professing to exhibit Christianity of a more exalted and a purer stamp than that exhibited by others, it will be both interesting and not uninstrusive for us to consider very briefly some of the particulars of their creed, as expressed by themselves. We have al-

ready remarked one feature, rather in the way of omission than as a positive exhibition of sentiment. However, as they advanced they took more elevated ground, and one of their characteristics was a decided opposition to what they called Calvinism, not joining themselves to the ranks of Arminianism—differing in many points from all classes of Arminians; but expressing, on every occasion in which it could be well drawn out, a cordial antipathy to every thing that presented itself to their minds under the notion of Calvinism. The first declarations against Calvinism that we meet with are moderate, and expressed in tolerant and kind language; but the antipathy increases, and the language gathers a proportionate degree of severity and strength. Mr. Jebb had, in his youthful simplicity, said something, in a sermon, against the lowering views of morality which he thought chargeable on Calvinists, and the enthusiastic zeal which he imputed to Wesleyan Methodists. Mr. Knox rebukes him for making a direct attack upon any people, and recommends him to combat error “by laying down the opposite truth with due cautionary observations, in the most dispassionate manner.” Then he proceeds to make his own remarks in a very well-tempered way, upon the Calvinists:

“Besides, to say nothing of my friends the Wesleyans, I own, with all their error and perplexity, I have a deep respect for Calvinists, or rather Augustinians. Their system, faulty as it is, has, in my judgment, served noble purposes in the world. Nor can I well conceive how experimental religion could have been maintained, in those dark ages without [it]. I cannot but think, that, as (in my mind) the Roman Catholic ceremonies were permitted, in order to keep up professional or visible Christianity, in the dark ages of society, so, Augustine's subtleties were no less wisely ordered for the purpose of sustaining practical and invisible Christianity. As the ceremonies contained within them a substance of Christian worship, so those subtleties, still more necessarily, contain within them the reality of experimental religion. No man can be a Romanist who does not hold, in theory at least, all the essentials of the Christian religion: and no man can be an Augustinian who does not hold the essentials of experimental religion. I do, humbly I hope, admire then, the fathomless wisdom of heaven, which permitted Christianity to embody itself in sensible rites, when, without such rites, the savage multitude might probably not have been impressed at all. And I equally view with wonder and pleasure, the metaphysical mind of St. Austin, unconsciously enclosing vital Christianity in a system of his own fabrication; which system, by its appositeness to the first workings of intellect, in its progress from barbarism to high improvement, should, by attracting and engaging a strong mental appetite, ensure the perpetuation and extended reception of the blessed nucleus within. This, I soberly take to be the final cause of Augustinian and Calvinistic subtlety. And I do believe, when its function is completed, it will fall off of itself. It certainly has, on experimental religion, much of the same effect which Popish worship has had on Christianity: but, while it has lessened its amiableness, it has, under

God's blessing, ensured its being attentively examined and cultivated. In fact, it has given a body to it, which, I must say, strikes me as having been highly indispensable, and infinitely beneficial."

.

"Before you reject all this as fanciful theory examine well what Augustinian orthodoxy necessarily contains in it. In maintaining the irresistible efficacy of divine grace, Augustine and his followers raised both this heavenly principle and its fruits, to a height beyond the reach of mere human nature. Pelagius, whom he opposed, represented it as within human reach; and, in fact, I presume, as a human business throughout; implying no radical change of nature, but mere amelioration and improvement. Austin, in opposing him, went, doubtless, to an extreme: but then, it was the safe side for spiritual religion; since, in exalting the efficient principle, he necessarily exalted its natural and necessary results. Where God himself works, it will be expected, or rather relied upon, that the work will be like himself. Augustine, therefore, in making so very much of grace could never make little of the work of grace; and accordingly we see that, in no instance, is the transit from a state of moral bondage to that of spiritual liberty more strikingly described than in St. Austin's own account of himself. For illustration of all this, see his Confessions, lib. ix. cap. 1."

In this, if there is much of philosophy, there is at least much of moderation. If there is a something not calculated to impress deeply on the reader a value for truth, as truth; but rather to lead him to dwell with complacency on the utility of error, there is, at least, a forbearance towards those whose error was different from his own.

In a subsequent letter, we have Mr. Knox going more into particulars, as to his objections to Calvinism, or, we should rather say, what he calls Calvinism:

"The grand error of Calvinism is the disjointing of God's favour, and preference, from moral qualifications, and thus distorting the whole beauty and grandeur of the Scriptures."

Here Mr. Knox lets out his objections against what he calls Calvinism, that is, against all the doctrines of grace; that they assert that God does not give his favour and preference to any man, on the ground of his moral qualifications: and, we would ask, is not this the doctrine of Scripture throughout? Is not this the doctrine of Paul, Rom. ii. 5, &c. "Even so, then, at this present time, also, there is a remnant according to the election of grace. And if by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise, grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace; otherwise work is no more work." Is it not the doctrine of Paul, again, Tit. iii. 5, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done;" does not this verse, in connexion with those preceding, "disjoin God's favour and prefer-

ence from moral qualifications." And if Christian preaching consists, as Mr. Knox says, p. 19,

"In representing man to be, by nature, a weak, ignorant, sinful, and of course, miserable being, and as such to be liable to God's displeasure,"

Must not God's preference and favour, if shown to any such sinful beings, be disjoined from moral qualifications? Where are the moral qualifications of a man dead in trespasses and sins?

Whilst we have thus noticed a doctrinal statement which we think highly erroneous, we have great satisfaction in quoting a passage, in which, if there is some error, there is also much very valuable truth upon that most important doctrine of human depravity:

"I own, I have as much aversion as is consistent with good nature and Christian charity, to the whole Socinian tribe. The system has grown out of certain concurrent characters of mind, led, by contingency, into theological disquisition. When a calm, cold, steady, subtle, self-confident temper, benevolent without passion, moral without coercion, happens to be revolted by the excesses of Calvinism, it, almost by a necessity of nature, runs back into Socinianism. To such a disposition there is no intermediate barrier, and there are some strong attractive influences—Socinianism flattering human reason so peculiarly, by bringing all Christianity, as is pretended, within its comprehension. Of this system, man's power to keep God's commandments, either by his own proper strength, or with some derived aids, which are so described, as, in my mind, to make little difference, is a fundamental principle; and therefore, they who hold it naturally take the opposite side to St. Augustine, in explaining Rom. vii. Doing this, however, under the propulsion of their general scheme, and not from unbiassed discriminative study of revealed truth, and for human truth, I certainly give them no great credit. I seem, to be sure, to see them on the same piece of ground with myself; but I cannot help asking how they came there, as I perceive no key in their hands. I suspect them, therefore, of having got to the spot which they occupy by breaking hedge. And, besides, when I look more narrowly, I doubt if they are, after all, on the same ground with me. If I mistake not, a deep river, not apparent at first view, runs between us, which can neither be forded nor stepped over.

"To drop allegory, I freely own my suspicion, that their doctrine of moral perfection rests not only on high views of human power, but on low views of moral sentiment. I never read any of the '*Fratres Poloni*;' but I have looked at the view of this subject given by the great Arminian theologian, Limborch, and it struck me that *his* perfection was rather of a moral than of a spiritual kind; such as might be attained by a good temperament, without much *felt* obligation to Divine Influence. I allow that the description appears to rise much higher; but I could not help suspecting that it was only appearance, from the slight view that seemed to be taken of human depravity. A deep sense of this, appears to me as necessary to true Christian perfection, as a sufficiently deep foundation, is necessary for

a lofty building. But I hardly think *he* can have this, who denies that that 'infection of nature' which 'doth remain in them that are regenerated' (Art. ix. Church of England) hath in it the nature of sin. That, when duly resisted, so as not to grow into volition, it brings no condemnation to the conscience, is agreed on all hands. But I am ready to think, that a feeling of its being sin *in esse*, though not *in actu*, is essential to that very resistance. We are curious machines, whose weights and springs depend on laws that we cannot alter. If the weight be deficient, the wheels will not move as they ought; nor can the error be removed but by removing the cause, i. e. by correcting the deficiency. We will not, therefore, I conceive, flee from every appearance of evil, except we cordially hate and dread it, root as well as branch. Accordingly, if we deem the first movements of concupiscence to have nothing *sinful* in them—nothing *offensive* to the nature of the all-perfect God, we shall not so *abhor* them, as to escape wholly their contaminating influence."

* * * *

"I will not ask whether I have made myself intelligible; because I trust to your power of finding me out. But I wish you to consider how essential an ingredient such a thorough radical sense of depravity as I have mentioned is to every stage of true Christianity. Indeed, if I were to state what I take to be the truest mark of difference between a genuine Christian and a mere moralist, pharisaical or philosophical, I would say that the latter found his ease in being insensible to his 'secret faults,' while the former is then easiest when he is most tenderly sensible of them. The moralist naturally wishes to discover no more than he has the means of conquering. The Christian, on the contrary, is solicitous to detect every, the minutest, as well as the deepest evils, because he knows that the omnipotent Saviour is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him; and that what he said to St. Paul, he said to all his faithful followers, 'My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness.' The Christian, therefore, says unfeignedly with the same apostle, 'When I am weak, then I am strong;' knowing well, that nothing can prevent the success of the process but his own insensibility to the need of it.

"I even sometimes fear that my own favourite latitudinarians were not as much alive to this depth of depravity as might be wished."

Here is the most important doctrine of human depravity laid down with a boldness and a clearness which leaves no doubt of the writer's sentiments. We could wish that this had ever been kept in mind; and whilst he now expresses his fear that his favourite latitudinarian divines were not as alive to it as might be wished, we should be very glad indeed, if we thought we had reason to say, that he himself and his correspondent always continued to keep it in mind, in the same clearness and in the same strength; but again we have reason to say that their early days appear to have been their best days. We believe there will not be found, in the subsequent parts of the two large volumes, so

clear and explicit an avowal of the deep depravity of human nature.

We have gone more at length in this early part of the correspondence, because we find in it more that we can commend, less that we are obliged to censure. We must hurry with a lighter step over the remaining parts.

(To be continued.)

THE LITURGY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—Your correspondent W. F. M. has hazarded the assertion that “there is no prayer in our Liturgy, addressed especially to the Third Person of the Trinity.” I have always, in my simplicity, considered the following clause in the Litany, as a prayer in our Liturgy, especially addressed to the Third Person of the blessed Trinity :

“O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, have mercy upon us, miserable sinners.”

If I am mistaken, perhaps you, or your correspondent, would do me the favour of setting me right.

Does your correspondent allow that the hymn “Veni Creator,” “Come, Holy Ghost, Creator come,” &c. &c., forms a part of the Liturgy of the Church of England? I have always considered it myself as such, and am, moreover, inclined to think that it forms another exception to his ill-considered assertion.

Yours,

A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

THE HOME MISSION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—Cordially attached to the Church of England, I am anxious to see her as effective as possible; and that in Ireland, and in every country where, under Providence, she has been planted, her influence should be extended to every class of persons. Were the whole population of a country brought to embrace the Church of England, and every parish to have its own church and its own pastor, I conceive that the discipline of the Church should be adhered to, and all its formularies and canons strictly observed; but where this is not the case, and the majority of the population do not embrace our faith, (as is the case in India and in Ireland,) I conceive a different plan of acting is called for.

Whoever looks at the conduct of our Church in India, both in the present and last century, must be sensible of this, and feel that practices which would in England be considered irregular, have in India been considered, by the heads of our Church, absolutely necessary to carry on the work. Were our clergy in India to confine their ministry merely to members of our Church, and to make no effort to convert the heathen, they evidently would not do their part as ministers of Christ. The same reasoning, I feel, applies to our own country. If the clergy attend merely to the Protestants, and do not use all means in their power for the conversion of the Roman Catholics, they do not act in conformity with their calling as ministers of Christ, and with their duty as clergymen of an established church; for it should never be forgotten that the object of an Establishment is to provide spiritual instruction for *every* class of persons. This feeling seems strongly impressed on the mind of the present Bishop of Down, whose "Primary Charge to the Clergy of Killaloe" I have now before me. After stating that

"A large majority of our collective population is in a state of alienation from our branch of the Catholic and Apostolical Church of Christ, and in the communion and under the authority of the Church of Rome," his lordship thus addressed the clergy: "You will not, I am sure, my reverend brethren, regard it as an idle or gratuitous assumption, that the removal of the errors of the Romish Church from the minds of our parishioners, and the substitution of that reformed code of Christian truth which we of the united Church of England and Ireland profess, is a task which, as far as we have power and opportunity, it is our duty to perform.

"It is our duty, indeed, abstractedly, as ministers of the Gospel of Christ, from which the members of *that* Church have been removed, that they may be made professors of another Gospel; but it is more especially our duty, by virtue of that solemn *pledge* by which we bind ourselves on our *admission* to her higher ministries."

His lordship then proceeds to show, from the ordination office, that the clergy are bound to "*banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's Word;*" and then shows, from unquestionable authority, that by erroneous and strange doctrines, our reformers must have meant the errors of the Church of Rome. ●

From the statement of this respectable prelate, and from the authority of our church, it is evident our clergy ought to do all in their power to convert to the true faith of Christ the Roman Catholics of our country, who compose the large majority of our population. But how is this to be done, as the Roman Catholics do not come to our churches, and as we have some parishes without churches for them to enter?

To this important question I would answer, let our clergy go wherever the Roman Catholics are willing to hear them—let those who have leisure follow the excellent plan of our Church Home Mission.

Should it be objected that it is irregular to preach in Court-houses, and School-houses—to this objection I would reply by referring to the example of the venerable Archbishop Ussher, (while Bishop of Meath,) of whom it is recorded that he preached constantly, not only in the church, but in the *Sessions-house*, because the Papists felt less difficulty in attending his ministry there than in the church.—To those who object to the Home Mission, because the clergy sometimes preach in School-houses, &c., I would propose the authority of Archbishop Ussher; and to all ministers who would be *pure from the blood* of their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, "who are perishing for lack of knowledge," I would urge the authority of the Great Head of the Church, "Go and preach the Gospel to every creature."

CLERICUS.

OBITUARY.

DEATH OF S. T. COLERIDGE, ESQ.

It is with feelings of deep sorrow that we announce the departure of this eminent poet, philosopher, and Christian, which took place July 25, 1834, after a long period of suffering at the house of his friend Mr. Gillam, of Highgate, near London. We are often called to announce the death of dear friends, or of those occupying useful stations in God's service, but rarely have our feelings been so acute as on the present occasion, for very seldom has the loss been so great. To his friends—and he had firm ones—the blank will never be filled up; and to those who, from the reverence they bore him, and the instruction they derived from his labours, might be called his disciples, his death is nearly as irreparable. Though unknown to him—and such was our own case—they have learned to venerate the mind which, achieving the proudest triumphs of intellectual power, cast all at the feet of the Saviour—professing, as he did, that if all the labours of his life served but to enlighten the path of one Bible student, he should be amply repaid. They have taken counsel with him in difficulties—striven with him against obstacles—followed the path he so ably pioneered; and if, by God's blessing, his word and doctrine has become clearer to their understanding, more accordant with their reason, and more elevating and binding upon their hearts, shall they not mourn when such a light is removed? May they not weep even whilst acknowledging the righteousness and goodness of God in calling his servant to the enjoyment of all the light, and holiness, and love, which he has prepared for the blessed? It is not our intention to give more than a very brief sketch of his life; our only materials are those furnished by himself, in his *Biographia Literaria*, an exceedingly interesting history of the progress of his mind, and which, together with his other works, we beg to recommend to the attention of our readers. In common with that of most literary men, his course was undisturbed by great events. He possessed no thirst for riches or this world's greatness. His mind was busied in the investigation of truth by severe and abstract study; and his relaxation was in the exercise of his poetical talent, and in the society of cultivated friends.

He was born at Bristol; and, in due time, sent to Christ's Hospital, London. Under the guidance of Rev. James Bower, head-master, he laid the foundation of that profound acquaintance with the ancient philosophers by which he was subsequently distinguished. At the termination of his studies in London he entered at Jesus College, Cambridge, and his residence there appears to have been a period of great enjoyment. The quiet and diligent routine course of study was very congenial to a mind unusually penetrating, and which already felt dissatisfied with the superficial (*super-facies*) character of modern philosophizing. At a subsequent period he was appointed secretary to Sir Alexander Ball, Governor of Malta, whose character he has embalmed in one of the volumes of "*The Friend*." It is truly an exquisite sketch, whether we view it as a tribute of personal affection to the memory of a great man, or merely as a biographical composition. During all this time his mind appears to have been in a state of incessant investigation—finding no resting place in past acquirements—insatiably pursuing any fresh source of knowledge which held out a prospect of attaining the truth of which he was in search. At one time he held Unitarian principles, and wandered amongst the errors of *Spinozism*; but whilst his intellect was thus astray, his heart, as he says, "was with Paul and John." No man, earnestly desiring light, was ever left finally in darkness; and Coleridge gradually advanced through a laborious and intricate mental process into a clearer understanding of the truth. His progress was deeply interesting and instructive; and God

raised up means for the pursuit of that knowledge which alone can give peace here, and a hope—a sure and certain hope of joy hereafter.

With what satisfaction the Messrs. Wedgwood must now recall their seasonable kindness to such a man; it was by their liberality that he was enabled to visit Germany, where his intellect became at length satisfied and deeply imbued with the principles of that school of deep and stern philosophy. But this was not all; for his mind appears about the same time, or perhaps earlier, to have become influenced by the truths of the Bible; so that, whilst receiving, with humility and striking simplicity, the ‘food of the Word,’ he, at the same time, vigorously pursued that line of investigation within the true limits of our faculties. He became, in short, that highest of all characters, a Christian philosopher. I may close this brief sketch of the events of his life, by mentioning that he has resided for the last twenty years with his friend Mr. Gillam, of Highgate, to whose house he first went on a visit of a week, a noble instance of kindness, which we are sure was not without its reward. Truly “some have entertained angels unawares.”

Coleridge's earlier publications were principally poetry, and by them he is the more generally known. That he possessed the genuine poetic temperament will scarcely be questioned, though, from the peculiar structure of his mind, the *degree* of inspiration may. In every department he is essentially original, but it is the originality of genius. With less of the fire of passion than Byron, he possessed as brilliant an imagination and a severer judgment; and in this alembic, every sentence was distilled, until the thought assumed its proper predominance over the words in which it was clothed. His language is, at the same time, nervously *English*, and as lucid as forcible. His facility of composition appears to have been great, and yet all his works have the finish of a master-hand. They may be aptly compared to the glowing, yet gentle beauty of a Claude Lorraine, with bolder and more vigorous sketches interspersed. His poetical works are now published together in three volumes. Of these and his prose works, we hope to be able to give a more lengthened notice hereafter, that our readers may better appreciate the excellence of his labours, than they could do from so short a notice as the present.

For some time he was editor of the *Morning Post*, and, as a political writer, was one of the few who applied history to its true use, by tracing the dependence of events on principles and the passions of man, and so from the past, anticipating the future. “On every great occurrence,” he says, “I endeavoured to discover in past history the event that most nearly resembled it. I procured the contemporary historians, memorialists, and pamphleteers. Then, fairly subtracting the points of *difference* from those of *likeness*, as the balance favoured the former or the latter, I conjectured that the result would be the same or different. In the *Essays on the ‘Probable final Restoration of the Bourbons,’* I feel myself authorized to affirm, by the effect produced on many intelligent men, that were the dates wanting, it might have been suspected that the *Essays* were written after the event occurred.” This, however, was far too philosophical for our party politics, and he relinquished the editorship. He published, likewise, a paper called “*The Watchman*,” and another called “*The Friend*,” neither of which continued long. Their subjects, and the manner of treating them, were evidently unsuited to the ephemeral interest of a periodical. The more valuable of the essays were afterwards collected by their author, and published, in three volumes, under the title of “*The Friend*.” His remaining prose works are, “*Aids to Reflection*,” “*The Statesman's Manual*,” “*A Lay Sermon*,” “*The Church and State according to the Idea of each*,” the latter originating in the question of Catholic emancipation. These are but few works to have been the result of a life's labour; but, as the dear old man himself said, we must take into account the amount of truths he put into circulation in other ways; and we

have no hesitation in saying, that few men have had *indirectly* so much influence on the mind of the age.

The style of Coleridge's prose works resembles more nearly some of the older divines, than any author we know. His expressions are clear, distinct, and forcible; his arrangement is simple and logical, his reasoning profound and accurate; and if you find difficulty in following him, it is evident to you that the fault is your own. There is a *je ne sais quoi* about his writing which convinces you that he perfectly knew that which he wished to convey. The philosophy he adopts (that of Kant) is, in his hands, at least, deprived of the danger attributed to it by those who are 'unlearned' in it, of leading the mind to doubt and infidelity; for he shows it not only subservient, but in the highest degree adapted to illustrate the principles laid down in the profoundest, as it is the simplest, of all books—the Bible.

Whilst commending highly his works for their philosophical character, it would be criminal not to notice the spirit of fervent piety which breathes in them throughout. In fact, Coleridge (and he alone) looked upon man as a whole; as having political and social relations to his fellows; as a being whose internal structure (so to speak) is most wonderful; but, above all, and inseparable from each, as a being holding certain relations to his Creator, the recognition of which must modify and influence the principles governing every other relation.

In accordance with this view, he takes the Bible as a source of absolute truth—not merely a revelation of God's grace to sinners, but as a fountain whence may be drawn principles which ought to regulate man in all that relate to him *as man*. In short, whether as a statesman, philosopher, or peasant, it ought to be to him as "a light to his feet and a lantern to his path."

Neither are these merely speculative views; it is manifest that, whilst the author states the perfect agreement of the Bible truths with our highest reason, and their true influence upon our understanding, his own heart has been touched and melted by the Spirit of truth; and that not only information and light, but sanctification and peace, have been imparted to his own bosom.

For those who do not know this "saint and sage," we subjoin the following exquisite letter, the last he ever wrote; and we are sure that those who have appreciated him will rejoice to see that the sun, which so often lighted their path, shone with still brighter glory as he sank to his rest. It is addressed to his god-child, Adam Steinmetz Kinnaird:

"MY DEAR GODCHILD.—I offer up the same fervent prayer for you now as I did kneeling before the altar, when you were baptized into Christ, and solemnly received as a living member of his spiritual body, the church. Years must pass before you will be able to read with an understanding heart what I now write. But I trust that the all-gracious God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, who by his only begotten Son (all mercies in one sovereign mercy!) has redeemed you from the evil ground, and willed you to be born out of darkness, but into light; out of death, but into life; out of sin, but into righteousness—even into the Lord our righteousness. I trust that He will graciously hear the prayers of your dear parents, and be with you as the Spirit of health and growth in body and mind. My dear godchild, you received from Christ's minister, at the baptismal font, as your Christian name, the name of a most dear friend of your father, and who was to me even as a son, the late *Adam Steinmetz*, whose fervent aspirations, and ever paramount aim, even from early youth, was to be a Christian in thought, word, and deed, in will, mind, and affections.

"I, too, your godfather, have known what the enjoyments and advantages

of this life are, and what the more refined pleasures which learning and intellectual power can bestow, and with all the experience that more than threescore years can give. I now, on the eve of my departure, declare to you (and earnestly pray that you may hereafter live and act on the conviction) that health is a great blessing; competence obtained by honourable industry, a great blessing; and a great blessing it is to have kind, faithful, and loving friends and relatives; but that the greatest of all blessings, as it is the most ennobling of all privileges, is to be indeed a Christian. But I have been likewise, through a large portion of my later life, a sufferer, sorely afflicted with bodily pains, languor, and manifold infirmities; and for the last three or four years, have, with few and brief intervals, been confined to a sick room; and at this moment, in great weakness and heaviness, write from a sick bed, hopeless of recovery, yet without prospect of a speedy removal.

"And I thus, on the brink of the grave, solemnly bear witness to you, that the Almighty Redeemer, most gracious in his promises to them that truly seek him, is faithful to perform what he has promised; and has reserved, under all my pains and infirmities, the inward peace that passeth all understanding, with the supporting assurance of a reconciled God, who will not withdraw his Spirit from me in the conflict, and, in his own due time, will deliver me from the evil one.

"O my dear godchild! eminently blessed are they who begin *early* to seek, fear, and love their God, trusting wholly in the righteousness and mediation of their Lord, Redeemer, Saviour, and everlasting High Priest, Jesus Christ.

"O preserve this as a legacy and bequest from your unseen godfather and friend.

"S. T. COLERIDGE.

"13th July, 1834, Grove, Highgate."

"Let me die the death of the righteous, O Lord, and let my last end be like his."

F.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
AND
Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXXVI. OCTOBER, 1834. VOL. III.

LOVE OF THE WORLD—A SERMON.

“ Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world.”

2 TIM. iv. 10.

OF Demas no other mention than this is made in Scripture; save that, in the Epistle to the Colossians, he is joined with Luke in sending his salutation to that church; and that, in the Epistle to Philemon, St. Paul styles him his fellow-labourer. Of the ancient ecclesiastical historians some assert that he became an utter apostate from the faith, and at length a priest to heathen idols. Others, on the contrary, maintain that he recovered from his fall, and was afterwards a bishop in the Christian church. But these matters do not much affect us. All that is necessary for us to know of the character of Demas is revealed in my text: and may we, every one, take warning by his example.

To consider his conduct in the least striking point of view, it shows how injuriously persons, who yield to the temptations of the world, will act in those relations which bind man to man. St. Paul uses no reproachful terms, but simply relates the fact, that Demas had forsaken him. If, however, we look to the time and circumstances of this desertion, we find, first of all, that it happened when the apostle, amidst so many trials, was left with but one solitary companion. “Only,” says he, “Luke is with me.” It was also when Paul was a prisoner in captivity at Rome. It was moreover in his old age; and, above all, when the hour of his martyrdom, as we find in this very chapter, was at hand. This was no time, if I may so speak, for Demas to desert his friend and father in the Gospel.

But this apostate was far more than ungenerous to a fellow mortal. In forsaking Paul, he forsook God. And so it is in every instance in which we reject the pious counsels

of ministers, parents, or any who are placed in authority over us. "No man hath seen God at any time." God does not speak to us immediately, as one man speaks to another. He speaks to us through means, and messengers, and through the appointed channels of his grace and providence. And if these are rejected, it is not the mere instrument we reject, but that God who uses it. "He that heareth you," says our Lord to his disciples, "heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." It is in this sense, I say, that Demas in forsaking Paul, forsook God. He turned his back upon the man who stood, as it were, between God and him; and in so doing, took the opposite direction from both; and moved away from the greater, as well as from the lesser light, thus acting in conjunction together.

Prone as we are by nature to depart from the living God, to do so is, to say the least of it, the utmost extreme of folly. It is the part of a wise man to fly from danger; but to forsake God is to fly from him who is the shield and the security of his creatures. The mariner, tossed by the tempest, and over whose head the waves are towering, seeks some firm ground on which to cast his anchor, or looks around if haply he may descry some peaceful and well-sheltered haven. Such a refuge is God to the human soul. Cast, as we are, on life's tempestuous ocean, there is no other point of rest to which the mind can fly. Sheltered beneath that Rock of Ages, we are in the very citadel of safety. Let us keep close in there, and though all the powers of darkness were in league against us, it would be a vain confederacy. And in that blessed fortress we are secured not only against the present dangers which the whole compass of creation could collect around us, but against whatever of fear or of alarm may fill the trackless regions of the future, or lie in the dark and exhaustless womb of the eternity to come.

In truth, if men could be brought to reflect upon themselves, and on what they are; if they would consider what it is to have been awakened into an existence, which will never end; if they kept in mind that they are now embarked on a voyage which, willing or unwilling, they must prosecute throughout eternity; they would then know the value of having an all-powerful, unchangeable, and everlasting friend. And such is God, to all who accept the mercies which are freely offered, and fly to the refuge set before them in the Gospel. The man who thus casts himself upon God, as upon the bosom of a Father reconciled in Christ Jesus, is freed from every painful apprehension. "He fears no evil tidings, for his heart standeth fast, believing in the Lord." "The Lord," says he, "is my light and my salvation; whom then shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom then shall I be afraid?"

But man does not merely want security: he is athirst for happiness. There is bound up in the very root and essence of the soul, the desire of some supreme and satisfying good. We breathe instinctively after some enjoyment pure and unalloyed; an enjoy-

ment which, little as men in general realize it, they still press after with unabated ardour. Nor can any disappointments cause them to doubt the existence of the object they have been so long pursuing, and never finding; for they feel that they are formed—their capacities, their affections, their insatiable longings, their boundless appetites—that all that is within them is formed to rest in such an object or to continue restless for ever. It is this intense desire of pure, unmingled happiness which sends man's darkened soul through all the haunts and mazes of false pleasure, of sensuality, novelty, and ambition. He takes these for the streams for which his nature pants; but he drinks them, and thirsts again. The aching void is still unfilled; the burning fever is still upon his lips: for these are not the water that springeth up into everlasting life. God alone can fill and satisfy the soul. All its breathings after happiness are but its native tendencies to God; are but the murmurings of the stream, until it mingle again with the parent ocean. Since God is then the centre of all substantial good, it would be our wisdom, if now hovering on the most distant borders of creation, to traverse all the regions of trackless space, in order that we might reach this central source of happiness. What then is the madness of those who have the living fountains near them, and who yet leave them, and forsake God.

But to do so, is not less vile, than it is hostile to our truest interest. To forsake God is to turn our backs upon the kindest benefactor, and the most generous friend. It was God who took us out of our mother's womb, and who was our hope upon our mother's breast. Since that time, through how many perils has he led us! How often, when we called on him in our trouble, has he delivered us out of our distress! But why should I endeavour to recount those mercies, which are more in number than the sand; which are renewed to us each morning; which meet us in the air we breathe, the sun that rises, the rain that descends, and the fruitful seasons which fill our hearts with food and gladness? If, however, we would fully see "what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us," we must leave the fields of nature, and enter into that sacred enclosure, that vineyard of God's more immediate planting, which the Scriptures open to our view. And while we look around upon those fruits which hang from all its hallowed branches, we shall then be able best to estimate the conduct of him who forsakes God. If love can, as it is said, beget love, what greater love hath any man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends? If large and costly gifts can win the heart to gratitude, could God give more than his only Son, his well-beloved? If he that is forgiven much loveth much, can we forget the ten thousand talents which God hath forgiven us? How long have we tried the patience and forbearance of the Lord? How often have we grieved his holy Spirit! In how many ways and instances have we offended the eyes of our Heavenly Father! And yet he has spared us, "as a

man spareth his own son that serveth him," and only repeated his invitations that we would turn to him and live. Can any thing then, I say, imply ingratitude so base, and degeneracy so deep, as to forsake a being thus tender, thus forgiving, thus overflowing with unspeakable goodness, and divine compassion?

It is an awful consideration, that to forsake God, in any sense in which the wicked would desire it, is a thing impossible. It would indeed be well for them if there were some forgotten and unheeded region; some dark corner of creation, unvisited by his beams; some spot upon the map of this wide universe, insulated from his rule, and beyond the pale of his administration. But in point of fact, there is no such city of refuge for the guilty; no such hiding place from God. There is indeed a separation wide and infinite between God and those that hate him. But it is not that kind of distance which divides off place from place, or east from west. It is that natural repugnance which separates good from evil, and light from darkness. In the latter way we may forsake God: in the former way we cannot. His enemies, not less than his friends, live, and move, and have their being, within the circle of his all-pervading essence. Those who would shun his presence can, as Augustin awfully expresses it, only fly from a God propitious, to a God averse. They can turn from his love, but it will be to encounter him in his displeasure. They can withdraw from the bosom of a heavenly Father, but it will be only to find that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of an angry God.

When Demas forsook Paul, and went, as we are told, to Thessalonica; when he separated himself from the society of the faithful, and from the visible body of Christ; the case was clear he had renounced his religion. But in our days, the state of things is quite different. All openly profess the religion of Christ. There are not now, therefore, the same broad and public marks who is serving God, and who is serving him not. Formerly if a man "in his heart departed from the Lord," he had no worldly inducements to continue in the church: he consequently avowed his infidelity, and was seen to pass over from one visible society to another. But now, if a man declines from God, the change is not one of name and profession, clear and legible to all. It is an inward movement of the mind, in which not only others, but he himself may be deceived. He is moving in a path which nothing can render visible, but the light of an awakened conscience.

That many professing Christians who present a fair exterior to the world have nevertheless forsaken God, no enlightened man can for a moment doubt. The question is, how shall each of us ascertain for himself whether this is his case or not?

In this investigation the point to be determined is not how far we live in the world. If this were the criterion we should have a very complicated and uncertain rule to go by. To lay down precise directions to what extent we are or are not to conform, in outward matters, to the habits of society around us, the more I consider it the less do I find myself competent to the task. Men's

stations in life, their tempers, relations, and responsibilities are so infinitely various that it is very difficult indeed for one individual to determine what may, in this respect, befit the circumstances of another. Let each in his peculiar sphere, praying to heaven for guidance, and aiming at an entire purity of intention, so act as one who must give account of himself to God. This is the best counsel which I can offer. No man can go materially wrong whose rule forbids him to mingle in any pursuits, or to be present in any scenes, into which he cannot carry a spirit of prayer, and where he cannot with an approving conscience keep in mind that, as a Christian, "the world is crucified unto him, and he unto the world."

In ascertaining then whether we have cleaved to God or deserted him, the main point is not how far we live in, but whether, like Demas, we love the world. Nor is this inquiry difficult, if we candidly pursue it.

One mark by which we may know that we love the world is this;—the inclinations of a person so disposed will always tend to a conformity with it. His enquiry will not be how far his duty obliges him to go into the world, but how far he may do so with safety to his soul. The child of God "is not of the world:" whenever his business, or profession calls him into it, he is in a scene unsuited to his taste; and consequently, the less he has of it, the better he is pleased. Not so with him who loves the world. Every permission to enter into it is so much gained to him. And though such a person may be so circumstanced as to mix but little with society, yet his friendship with the world will always show itself, when he has opportunity, by the manner in which he drinks into its spirit. No symptom of our spiritual state can be more unfavourable than that of feeling ourselves thoroughly in our element with worldly people. Even when these latter are not, in their conversation, violating any rules of propriety, there is a levity of spirit about them which no religious man can find congenial to his own feelings. It is hard to describe this, or to tell how it is that persons of different minds about religion will ascertain, as if by some inward tact, that they are not alive to the same objects and interests. But such is the fact. And allow me to say, that if any of you are at a loss to conceive my meaning in this particular, that slowness of apprehension ought to lead you to self-inspection. For all these are matters of experience as much as the sense of bodily pain and pleasure is. And if you do not know what it is to feel somewhat of pain and trial in mere worldly intercourse, you have too much reason to fear that your tempers are unsanctified, and your hearts unchanged; that, in a word, like Demas, you "love this present world."

Another proof of this attachment is, where men do not desire any change or improvement, religiously speaking, in the state of things around them. Taking the world as it is, it may, I conceive, be laid down as a principle, that no man's heart is right with God, unless he would be anxious, if he had the

power, to render the circle or scene in which he lives, more devoted to God than it now is. A person may be, for instance, a member of a religious neighbourhood, or a religious family, and go with the stream. But no neighbourhood or family is, or ever was, as perfect as it ought to be: and if the individual in question breathes no wishes for their advancement or improvement, what proof does his case afford, that he has any genuine religion at all? Religion happens to be the fashion around him, and he may yield himself passively to the current; but if he merely partakes of the motion of that body to which he is accidentally attached, and has no personal anxiety to accelerate that motion, how can he be sure that one particle of all this is his own? that he has any free movement, or voluntary tendency towards God, himself? Such a man may be the mere creature of circumstances. Let the habits of society change, and he will change with them.

In this kind of state are many members of what may be termed serious families, at the present day. They comply, through easiness of temper, perhaps, or from necessity, now grown into acquiescence, with certain habits of the religious world. And, living within enclosures thus marked off from general society, they are reckoned amongst the religious. But, for my own part, I know no human beings farther from God, in heart, and mind, than persons so circumstanced, sometimes are. They have a deadness to religion, peculiar to themselves. It is their daily companion, and it never yet gave them one hour's pleasure. They are, if I might so explain myself, like a woman who is married to one, towards whom she feels indifference, or aversion. She is continually with him. She is called by his name. She is, to a certain extent, subject to his authority. But there is no heart in the connexion. She is neither amused by him as a stranger, nor interested by him as a friend. Such persons, though they do not oppose religion in the lump, yet in detail they never give it a helping hand. In every debatable point as to the arrangements of the family, they always lean to the side of the world. Between them and the pious members of the circle, a daily system of mutual counteraction is going forward. If strangers are to be entertained, a struggle commences, whether the conversation is to take a religious turn, or to fall into the common-place gossip of the day. If music is to be introduced anxieties again conflict whether it is to be sacred music, or not: whether hymns of praise to God, or songs to excite and flatter the vanities of the mind. And here, without meaning to speak severely of what are called the amusements of the world, (for they belong a'together to another system, and I take it for granted that no serious persons partake of them,) I cannot but express my wonder that some who have renounced them wholly, should encourage in their houses music of this latter description. On what principle of consistency, I would ask, then, is it, that a young lady should object to take her part in a general dance, and then sit down alone to sing love ditties, for the entertainment of

a mingled company of both sexes? If religion consists altogether in the freewill offering of the heart; if a cup of cold water, or a widow's mite, is registered in the books of heaven, because God values not the gift, but the love which prompts, and sanctifies the gift; is it not clear that characters such as I have now described, are far from the kingdom of heaven? For what avails it that mere accident should encircle them with what the world might think unnecessary restraints, if in the only instances in which they could show a voluntary attachment, they present nothing but a cold heart to God? And how, I repeat it, does that attachment appear in those who are contented merely to be carried with even a religious system; if they do not desire to invigorate that system; if they do not throw their hearts into its right tendencies, and, in a word, feel anxious that it should become still more religious than it is?

The same principle holds good on the wider theatre of the world at large. It is not that the sincere Christian should be ready to take a part in every hasty project, for acting religiously on society. His humility will often lead him to doubt that however desirable reforms may be, he is either called or fitted to be an agent in them. But still, on the other hand, the man who gives a cold and suspicious hearing to every wish which others breathe after some better state of things; whose prejudices are all in favour of prevailing habits; whose fears are alive only to change or innovation in the moral constitution of the world; such a mind "savours the things that be of men, and not the things that be of God." It is true that some check and drag-chain upon the too forward movements, upon the over-anxious and earnest efforts of erring through honest zeal; it is true that this counteraction is often overruled to salutary purposes. But to be overruled for good is not to stand excused. "It must needs be," says our Saviour, "that offences come:" it is part of God's foreknowledge and calculation that they should: "but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh."

Nor can it be denied that society has, on the whole, considerably advanced of late in religious matters. But has not this advance been made against the wishes and the judgment of such characters as I have described? Has not their disposition been, to throw suspicion on every plan, and to put down each effort as it arose to stem the torrent of corruption, to spread abroad the knowledge of salvation, and to promote the glory of God? But, even with all its improvement, is society in such a state, that we have only to sit down, and let the system work for itself, and to say, in the language of the old proverb, "let well alone?" If you wish to try, go through this city * a few hours hence, "and seek in the broad places thereof," and behold the torrent of pollution which will pour down all its streets. Or, if you would take higher ground, put the gentry of the land to this plain test; ask them whether they have made up their minds,

* This Sermon was preached in Dublin.

and are ready, openly to avow, that they would under no circumstances fight a duel. If they have not so resolved, ask them, why? And what answer can be given, but that when the law of heaven, and the law of opinion are at issue, the latter must be obeyed? That in the last appeal, which sets all compromise at defiance, they will stand to their allegiance to the world, and reject the authority of God: thus worshipping the creature, more than the Creator? And is a mind, which, in such a state of things places all its guards, and throws out all its signals of alarm on the side of change, and innovation, right with God? Is this, as some would call it, a spirit of moderation, of benevolence, and of submission to God's providence? No. Such men deceive themselves. The true secret of the matter is, that they have no sensibility to sin, no awful impressions of eternity, that they are at rest here below, and, like Demas, love this present world.

Yes: it is because the world is present, while the glories of a higher system are invisible; it is because the world encompasses us on every side, and plays at every moment on our senses, that it entangles, and destroys such multitudes of souls. In theory it might be argued that no present temptations, when weighed against eternal interests, could influence, or determine a rational and immortal being. But theory and fact are different things. The melancholy truth is, that in man's fallen state, all the hopes, and fears of eternity; all that God, in his own word can say, about an endless heaven, or an endless hell, can no more expel the spirit, and power of this present world from his heart, than the summer's breeze can tear the everlasting hills from their foundations. The motives are in themselves awakening, and alarming; sufficient, one might almost suppose, to raise the dead. But they cannot act upon the natural mind. We must come under the influence of a higher principle than nature, or we cannot be suitably affected by eternal interests. Reason may "approve things excellent;" common sense must allow the superior importance of eternal, to temporal concerns; but reason and common sense cannot change man's nature. In spite of their convictions he will continue just the same as ever. This present world will be his portion and his God.

Would you then desire to be rescued from the system of enchantment, and ruin which surrounds you? Pray to God for this great deliverance. Pray that he will create, and make in you, a new and contrite heart. Pray to him, like Bartimæus, that your eyes may be opened, and that you may see the things that belong unto your peace. Pray to him for faith in the atonement, made for sin; in the promises of the Gospel; in the truth and reality of the spiritual and eternal world. And may those prayers be heard! May they obtain for you that faith which alone can overcome the world! May you then run with patience, the race that is set before you, laying up your treasures in heaven, and looking for your recompense at the resurrection of the just!

H. W.

THE HISTORY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN IRELAND.*

(Continued from page 622.)

WE assume the liberty of making further use of Mr. Reid's work, without yet entering into the actual object of his history—namely, a narration of transactions connected with the rise and progress of Presbyterianism—in order to discuss the religious state of Ireland previous to the reformation.

We find, from a very early age, that the clergy of Ireland, however they may have succeeded in their missionary exertions in foreign countries, had made no effectual efforts in their own. Indeed, whether abroad or at home, our Irish saints seemed to consider that their mission and their ministry were to be exerted more in increasing the number of monasteries and monastics, in creating and enlarging sodalities of monks and nuns, than in turning the common people from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God. To cast the halo of sanctity about their persons; to *taboo* their property and their institutions; to affright and to awe the *profanum vulgus* by a multitude of feigned miracles, and erect a solemn awful boundary between the sanctified and profane—this was the great object of churchmen, and in this they in a great measure succeeded, except when the extravagant and uncurbed passions of the laity were called into play by the rivalry of the *saints* themselves, who urged the *REGULI* of Ireland to espouse their local quarrels, and act as partizans in the contest of opposing Bishops and Abbots. It was the proud boast of the Irish clergy, that the natives of the saintly isle never, until the arrival of the Saxon, had made a martyr. This *fact*, to any one acquainted with the national story, only shows how, at once and effectually, they became priest-ridden; it only shows that a sort of tacit composition existed between the interns and the externs, between the clergy and the laity: to wit, that if the kings and Tanists of Ireland respected the property, the right, and the persons of the clergy, if they kept up a show of *outward* obedience to the church, they might con-

* The History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, comprising the Civil History of the Province of Ulster, from the accession of James the First: with a Preliminary Sketch of the progress of the Reformed Religion in Ireland during the sixteenth century, and an Appendix, consisting of Original Papers. By James Seaton Reid, D.D., Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Carrickfergus.—Waugh and Innes, Edinburgh; William Curry, Jun. and Co. Dublin; W. M'Comb, Belfast; and Whittaker and Co. London. 1834.

tinue their bloody feuds, their rapines and their murders, and work still all uncleanness with greediness. It is asserted by some historians, that the male children of the ancient Irish, when about to be dipped in the baptismal font, had the right arm kept out of the laver of regeneration, in order that in future life they might, with a safe conscience, plunge that unsanctified arm in human blood. This, perhaps, is untrue: ignorance and superstition could not be permitted to so react on each other as to pardon this abomination. But the very statement, however unfounded it might be, at least shows that the religion taught them did not withhold, in any effectual way, from deeds of blood. And doubtless the clergy were so highly valued, as absolvers of crime, ready at all times, for a consideration, to wash away the old score of crime, in order that a new tally might be begun—and as the bandit peasant of Italy, dwelling within sight of the Vatican, holds up in one hand his carbine, and in the other his image of the Virgin Mary; the one effectual to protect his body, and the other to save his soul—so the Irishman, after satisfying the Brehon,* by paying down so much coin, or so many cows, as an ERIC for murder, then proceeded to the priest, and from this ready pardoner obtained in absolution a pledge of security for his soul.

The evils that a degrading, mind-subduing, priest-fostering superstition brings down on every nation submitted to its curse, were amply exemplified in Ireland; and so we find it at the same time the island of sinners and of saints. Let any one turn to the two immense folios of Colgan, where the acts and monuments of the worthies that are there beatified and canonized are told at large, and see how they performed miracles, that cast into shade all that ecclesiastical history has elsewhere recorded; how they underwent penances that rival the mortifications of the Yogees, and Santons, and Fakeers of Hindostan; how they, while making religion of trifles, trifle with religion: and yet, with all this, even according to the showing of their own priestly writers, Druidism was not driven out of the land; pagan rites and abominations were not exterminated. The well-worshipping, the muttering of incantations, and turning of stones, whereby evil was called down on an enemy, and the storm and the thunder

* The Brehon, or Irish judge, used to sit on a heap of stones, on the top of a hill—generally one of those artificial hills now called MOATS; and there, without canopy or covering, without clerks, registers, or records; without any formality, or form, he passed his judgments. Every Tanist had one of those arbitrary Brehons, who, of course, took care not to disoblige his patron. The greatest crimes, as murder and rape, were punished no otherwise but by an Eric, or fine, whereof the Brehon had the eleventh part for his fee. Robbery and theft, provided they were not from the clergy, were not counted as offences at all.

were invoked to destroy: all these dregs of paganism* remained and still exist in the land; and what a thousand years ago the western Irish thought and acted in these respects, still is a matter of observance with modern Connaughtmen, where the light of the Bible has not illuminated, and where they still look to their priest as answerable for what they believe, and capable of absolving them from the sin of any thing they do.

The more saintly, then, Ireland became the more sinful were its people. What was it to the barbarian and bloodthirsty mass, whether Armagh, or Clonard, or Lismore, sent forth herds of clerics, crowds of bishops, who, consecrated by whole-sale, and unprovided even with sees in *partibus infidelium*, passed into Britain, and from thence to the Continent, so much so, that they became as great a burden and a nuisance to the countries they infested as a cloud of locusts. These men, having laid aside the primitive gospel for the Portuis and the Breviary, became the propagators of false doctrine, of absurd discipline, and of a grinding priestcraft over Christendom. That they did little good to poor Ireland, that honest but reluctant witness, friar Peter Walsh, confesses as follows:

“By all that I have above said, you may perceive that the Christian religion (that is, the anti-Bible religion of monkery) wrought so little on that people towards the abatement of their mortal feuds, that under it their princes were much more fatally engaged in pursuing one another with fire and sword, and horrid slaughters, to the utter undoing of themselves, and weakening of their country, and making it an easy prey to foreigners after, than their pagan predecessors had been.” Nay, more. “Not even the greatest holiness!!! (such holiness!!!) of some of their very greatest and most justly celebrated saints has been exempt from the fatality of this genius of putting their controversies to the bloody decision of battles.” (Page 99, Prospect of Ireland.)

Again, Peter Walsh says, page 83:

“That during the time the Irish were a FREE people, and while the Christian religion!!! was so conspicuously flourishing with MYRIADS OF HOLY PROFESSORS!!! yet their princes, and nobles, and other martial men were as furiously given to the destruction of one another as their ancestors had been in the time of paganism.”

Such was the state of Ireland before the conquest.

* See Doctor Charles O'Connor's account of the well-worshipping of the Connaught Irish, in his “Letters of Columbanus.”

See the account of Connaught Superstitions, in a late Number of the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, as extracted from the *Protestant Journal*.

Surely of such monkish Christianity it could not be said,

“*Emollit mores, nec ainit esse ferus.*”

At this period, it could not be asserted that Saxon conquest or example had influence in deteriorating the people. Left to themselves, the Christianity of the middle ages had free operation; what it effected, their own historians have reluctantly acknowledged. As in our former number, after giving our own view of the religious state of Ireland, with respect to doctrine, we had recourse to the industry of Mr. Reid for a description of its state from the conquest to the reformation; we now apply to him again, and take advantage of his valuable researches, while, as follows, he describes the moral state of the clergy and laity of Ireland during the same period:

“The standard of their morals was not higher than that of their learning. Canonical obedience, everywhere a leading feature in the character of the Romish clergy, was grossly violated in Ireland by the occasional insubordination of the prelates, and the frequent contumacy of the inferior orders. It was no unusual spectacle to see rival bishops and priors contending for their preferments by force of arms; and, in opposition to both Pope and King, persisting for years in these degrading contests.* Their conduct was characterised by the keenest animosities among themselves, and the most tyrannical oppression towards their people when charged with crime, though at the same time guilty themselves of many scandalous violations of the moral law.† Whilst chastity was lauded and professed by the priesthood as the chief of virtues, they were notorious for the most shameless profligacy. Bishops openly kept their harlots, and alienated the property of their sees by prodigal

* “Thus, in the year 1250, there were, for a time, two Bishops of Meath contending for that see. Ware, i. 143.—In 1489, there were two bishops of Culmore, and the clergy not being able to terminate their disputes, both were permitted to enjoy the dignity for many years. Cox, i. 183.—In the end of the fifteenth century, the priory of Kilmainham, a dignity equal to that of a bishop, was stoutly contested by two candidates, even by force of arms, for a considerable time. See this curious case in Ware’s *Annals*, ad. an. 1485.”

† “A sample of these prelatic oppressions may be seen in Ware, i. 408-10, in the case of a Bishop of Ossory, who caused two persons to be burned for witchcraft, and imprisoned a supposed accomplice. This man being set at liberty by the interposition of one Poer, the indignant bishop excommunicated the latter for heresy, and had him imprisoned in Dublin. He being humanely treated by the lord justice, the bishop again took fire, and accused the lord justice himself of heresy—the never-failing expedient, in those days, of all discomfited priests. The lord justice, however, freed himself from this charge, and convicted the arrogant prelate of gross partiality and injustice, who was now, in his turn, accused of heresy by his metropolitan, and obliged to fly. Having effected his return, however, he excommunicated the lord treasurer of the kingdom, and gave abusive language to the chief justice while sitting in court. He was tried for being an accomplice in the murder of one Le Poer, and in the burning of his castle; but escaped by pleading the king’s pardon.”

grants to their illegitimate progeny.* Their metropolitans occasionally interfered to repress such scandalous excesses; but while the offenders were under the prescribed discipline, the crime was perhaps repeated, and a new penance had again to be endured.† Even the provincials of the regular clergy were not exempt from this general incontinence, and their offspring sometimes attained the highest dignities in the church.‡ The inferior orders of the clergy did not fail to improve on the example so openly set them by their bishops, and to take ample advantage of the license afforded by the lax morality of their superiors.¶ Sometimes, indeed, a prelate arose, who, detesting such profligacy, subjected the conduct of his clergy to stricter scrutiny than usual, and thereby revealed, in the number of the offenders, the great extent to which these crimes had prevailed.§

* "In 1434, a Bishop of Down openly cohabited with a married woman, whom he kept in his palace; nor was it till seven years after his metropolitan had noticed his immorality, that he was punished for persisting in this flagrant conduct. Ware, i. 202. In 1370, a Bishop of Kilmore is described by another prelate, as 'much blackened on account of his lusts.' Ibid. 227. In 1469, a Bishop of Raphoe was proceeded against for incontinence and other offences, 'quæ propter religionis et dignitatis scandalum subticemus.' On submitting to due penance, he was absolved. Ibid. 274. Two successive bishops of Ferns laid waste the revenues of that see by grants to their bastards. Ibid. 448."

† "See this statement exemplified in the case of a bishop of Derry. Ware, i. 290."

‡ "An illegitimate son of a provincial of the Carmelites became archbishop of Cashel. Ware, ii. 85. See also the preamble to the bill passed by the Irish parliament in 1569, which will be afterwards given. It may be added, that, when Bale, in the beginning of the year 1553, came to Knocktopher, in the county of Kilkenny, the parish priest boasted to him that the last prior of the suppressed monastery in that town was his father. "I asked him," said Bale, "if that were in marriage? He made me answer, No; for that was, he said, against his profession. Then counselled I him that he never should boast of it more. 'Why,' saith he, 'it is an honour in this land to have a spiritual man, as a bishop, an abbot, a monk, a friar, or a priest, to father.' With that I greatly marvelled, not so much of his unshamefaced talk, as I did that adultery, forbidden of God, and of all honest men detested, should there have both praise and preferment; thinking in process, for my part, to reform it.' *Vocacyon of Johan Bale, apud Hal. Mis. i. 340. Lond. 1809. 8vo.*"

¶ "So lately as the beginning of the sixteenth century, the state of the morals of the inferior clergy in Galway was such as to call for the following enactments on the part of the corporation of that town. A.D. 1520. 'That no priest, monk, canon, or friar, shall have a w—e or leman in any man's house within this town; and that man which keepeth said, &c. shall forfeit 20s.' 1530. 'Enacted, that any priest or vicar of the college found with any fault or crime, to lose one hundred shillings and their benefice; and also if he or they keep any w—e being with child, or bearing him children, to pay the above penalty.' Hardiman's Galway, 202, 238."

§ "An archbishop of Dublin," says Ware, "in the end of the twelfth century, was such an enemy to incontinence in his clergy, that at one time he sent a hundred and forty clerks to Rome, who had been convicted of the same, in order to obtain absolution from the Pope, although he had power of granting it to them himself." Ware, i. 314."

“ Under a clergy, so ignorant and dissolute, it is no wonder that the spirit of true religion had been altogether banished from the kingdom. The doctrinal and practical errors which defaced the communion of the Romish church need not be enumerated. It is enough to state that they flourished in Ireland in their most fatal luxuriance, accompanied by their inseparable attendant, the grossest superstition. In proportion as this baneful spirit extended itself over the kingdom, a multitude of monasteries sprang up, which, though originally designed for pious and benevolent purposes, speedily degenerated, and in their turn increased the evil that had given them birth. Nearly six hundred religious houses, belonging to eighteen different monastic orders, were scattered over the entire island, the inmates and members of which were calculated to be as numerous as all the other inhabitants of the kingdom.* These individuals derived their chief support from the superstitious feelings of the laity, which were, therefore, the more studiously fostered. A continual rivalry existed between the monks and friars on the one hand, and the parochial clergy on the other; each party struggling for the pre-eminence in deluding and impoverishing the people. Hence the importance that was attached to the sight and touch of consecrated relics, to the possession of papal indulgences, and to devout visits to the shrines of favourite saints. Crowds of Irish pilgrims resorted to Italy, Spain, and the sister kingdoms, many of whom not unfrequently perished in these dangerous journeys.† The Irish clergy, however, possessed a station at home, the unrivalled merits of which they failed not to publish through the most distant countries. St. Patrick's purgatory, situated in an island in Lough Derg, in the county of Donegal, was long a favourite resort with the superstitious Romanists. It was set forth as containing a passage through which the devout worshipper might enter into the other world, and behold, in all their reality, the felicities of the heavenly state, as well as the torments of purgatory and the pains of hell‡ Penances performed at this privileged station

* “ Monast. Hiber. Pref. p. xi.”

† “ In 1451, about fifty persons went out of the diocese of Dublin to Rome, to celebrate a jubilee, seven of whom were pressed to death there in a crowd, and many more died on their return. Ware, i. 341. We find the mayor and bailiffs of Waterford going in pilgrimage to St. James', of Compostella, in Spain. Ware's Annals, ad. an. 1483. In 1508, Lady Margaret Athy went on a similar pilgrimage. Hardiman's Galway, 272. Like ‘ the wife of Bath,’ she

Thies hadde ben at Jerusaleme,
She hadde passed many a strange streme;
At Rome she hadde ben, and at Boloine,
In Galice, at Seint James, and at Coloine.”

‡ “ This celebrated station came first into notice about the middle of the twelfth century. I find in ‘ Rymer's Fœdera,’ folio edit. vol. iii. part i. p. 174-5, a safe-conduct, granted by Edward III. on the 24th October, 1358, to Maletesta Ungarus, a knight of Rimini, in Italy, to visit Lough Derg, who, it appears, was sent thither by the Pope to do penance; (Richardson's Folly of Pilg. p. 42,) and another of the same date to Nicholas de Becario, a nobleman of Ferrara, in Lombardy. In Rym. vol. iii. part iv. p.

were represented as of special efficacy to purge away the deadliest sins, and restore the soul to spotless purity. No wonder, then, that it was annually visited by crowds of devotees, not only from the remoter districts of Britain, but even from the most distant parts of Europe. So shameless, however, were the impositions practised here by the priests on the credulous multitudes, that the indignation of the Holy See was excited, and it was ordered by the Pope to be demolished at the end of the fifteenth century.* But it was too gainful a superstition to be relinquished, even at the command of the sovereign pontiff himself; and though the government, more than once since the Reformation, attempted to suppress it,† it continues to the present day to attract and delude the people. Many other stations, though of inferior celebrity, existed in various parts of the kingdom, where the prescribed penances of the church were performed, and where crowds of infatuated votaries sought to obtain absolution by rigorous acts of mortification to which they subjected themselves at these hallowed spots. In these and similar degrading observances nearly the whole of practical religion was made to consist; while, at the same time, the doctrinal truths of the Bible were altogether obscured, and 'made of none effect' by human traditions. The majesty of JEHOVAH was insulted by the worship of images, pictures, and crosses; and his holy law made void by the profligate doctrine of venial, as distinguished from mortal sin. The atonement of the REDEEMER was superseded by the idolatrous sacrifice of the mass; and the sufficiency of his intercession denied by the intervention of the Virgin Mary and a crowd of saints, as additional and indispensable mediators. The efficacy of the SPIRIT, in purifying the soul from sin, was undervalued by the lucrative figment of a purgatorial process after death, which it was in the power of the clergy to shorten, when bribed by an adequate remuneration. Repentance was understood as synonymous with bodily penance, and faith with dependence on the clergy, who blasphemously claimed the prerogative of forgiving sin. Piety was confined to the repetition of unmeaning ceremonies or of prayers in an unknown tongue; and inward purity of heart was exchanged for external conformity with the rites of the church. Nothing remained of the 'Glorious Gospel of the Blessed God' but the name; and even this could scarcely be recognized under the mass of superstitious follies and abuses with which it was encumbered.

135, there is another safe-conduct granted by Richard II. on the 6th of September, 1397, to Raymond, viscount de Perilleux and knight of Rhodes, with a train of twenty men and thirty horses. There is also a testimonial extant from Octavianus, archbishop of Armagh, so late as the year 1485, certifying that John Garhi, Francis Proly, and John Burgess, three French pilgrims, had visited this station, and performed the usual penances. Jones' *St. Pat. Purg.* p. 58-9. I may add that James Young, a notary-public of Dublin, wrote 'A History of the Pilgrimage of Laurence Rathold, a knight and baron of Hungary, to St. Patrick's Purgatory, an. 1411.' Ware, ii. 88."

* "By Pope Alexander VI. in the year 1497."

† "By the Lords Justices of Ireland, in the year 1632, and by act of Parliament, in the reign of Queen Anne."

"In reverting to the situation of the laity, it will be found to have been most deplorable. Without education, without even ordinary civilization, enslaved by error, and debased by superstition, the dupes of designing monks, and the slaves of haughty and bigoted priests, what could be expected but the grossest ignorance and irreligion? No rank or station could be exempted from this general character. Even the chiefs and nobles were proverbially turbulent and licentious, devoid of either religion or education,* and characterised, even in those unsettled times, by a more than ordinary degree of violence and insubordination. The history of Ireland during this period is only a record either of disgraceful combinations among these petty despots for the purposes of rapine or revenge; or of dishonorable conspiracies, sometimes against known allies, marked by the basest treachery and the most revolting cruelty. Even religion, which usually commands the superstitious veneration of the most lawless chieftains, was frequently outraged. Neither its temples nor its ministers were secure against their violence. So late as the fifteenth century, the chief of a northern clan destroyed above forty churches in Ulster, and was himself soon after massacred in one of them, to which he had fled for refuge, but which his own previous spoliations had rendered insecure.† Noblemen of the highest rank in the kingdom did not hesitate to avenge themselves on neighbouring bishops, by the ruin both of their cathedrals and their palaces;‡ while they who were less profane or violent, only rushed into the opposite extreme of superstition. It is lamentable to read of noblemen sending embassies to Rome for permission to translate the bones of favourite saints to more attractive shrines;§ and to hear their occasional reverses of fortune ascribed to their having altered the patron saint of some sacred edifice.|| But it is

* "Cox relates, that even so late as the end of Henry VIII's reign, 'most of the letters of the great Irish lords, (even some of English extraction) were subscribed with a mark, very few of them being able to write their names.' I. 281."

† "MacGilmore was the name of this '*corbi*,' as he was called, or unbaptized Irishman. He had rifled the church of the Minorites in Carrickfergus, and taken away the iron bars by which the windows were secured; and having afterwards fled to it for refuge from the hostile clan of the Savages, he was easily captured and massacred. Ware's Annals, ad. an. 1408. Cox, i. 147."

‡ "In 1369, a southern chief rifled the church of Limerick of its books, ornaments, and chalices, which he was afterwards obliged to restore. Cox, i. 129. The earl of Kildare being offended with the archbishop of Cashel, burnt his cathedral to the ground. Ware's Annals, ad. an. 1503. His excuse for this wanton outrage was, 'that he would not have done it, but that he thought the archbishop was in it.' Cox, i. 9."

§ "In 1185, John De Courcy sent an embassy to Rome, to Pope Urban III., for permission to translate the bodies of St. Patrick, Columba, and Bridget, just then discovered, as it was thought, at Downpatrick. Ware's Annals, ad. an. 1185."

|| "By the above De Courcy the cathedral of Down, previously dedicated to the Trinity, was dedicated to St. Patrick, which, says a contem-

still more lamentable to find them, after lives marked by the deepest guilt, confidently resorting to the erection of a chapel, or the endowment of a monastery, as an infallible passport to the Divine acceptance. The chief magistrates of the first cities in the kingdom were content to perform public penances, and to go on distant pilgrimages, as atonements enjoined by the clergy for ecclesiastical misdemeanours.* Inferior delinquents were lustily cudgelled for their sins, and bore with patience this degrading discipline, being taught to consider it as indispensable to the welfare of the soul.†

“The mass of the people were, if possible, sunk still deeper in ignorance and superstition. To keep the people in profound darkness has indeed been, when practicable, the policy of the Romish church in all countries. But the attainment of this object was unhappily facilitated in Ireland by the jealousy of the British court, who prohibited the use of the Irish language, through the vain idea of banishing it altogether from the kingdom, to make way for the adoption of the English tongue.‡ Though this absurd project failed, yet its natural consequence, in the mean time, was to retard the instruction of the people, who were, as far as possible, prevented from obtaining either teachers of their own nation, or books in their own language. The benefits of the art of printing were not extended to the Irish language till after the Reformation, when books were first printed in that character.§ The clergy had, therefore, little difficulty in retaining the people in that profound ignorance, which renders them at all times fit subjects of priestly domination. The instruction professedly given by their clergy was both extremely scanty in itself, and calculated only to deepen the gloom in which they were involved. Preaching constituted no part of the clerical office; and what occasionally assumed the name, was a tissue of silly fables, or of legendary tales of saints and martyrs. The inculcation both of religion and of morality was neglected, and their high sanctions were superseded by the mere terrors of bodily penances. The priests were

porary annalist, as quoted by Ware, “many believed was the cause of all those misfortunes that afterwards fell upon him.” Ware’s *Annals*, ed. an. 1183.”

* “The mayor of Dublin, in the year 1512, was compelled to go barefoot through the city, on account of the citizens having, in a riot, defaced some of the images in St. Patrick’s Cathedral. Cox, i. 202. See also in note 31, the mayor of Waterford sent on a pilgrimage to Spain.”

† “In the year 1268 it was ruled in Dublin by the clergy, that an offending citizen should, for the first sin, be fined; for the second, be cudgelled about the church; and, for the third, be cudgelled in front of the public religious processions, annually made through the city. Ware, i. 323.”

‡ “So early as 1367, the use of the Irish language was punished with the loss of lands. Cox, i. 127. It had, however, spread so extensively, even over the English Pale, that in 1494 this penalty was withdrawn. Ibid. 188.”

§ “Irish types were introduced into the kingdom in 1571; and the first book printed with them was a catechism written and printed by John Kerney, treasurer of St. Patrick’s, Dublin, entitled ‘Alphabeticum et ratio

often non-resident,* and the churches deserted or ruined. The Sabbath was systematically profaned,† and holidays of human institution alone kept sacred. And when to all these circumstances are added the example both of the civil and spiritual rulers, and the facilities afforded to the most abandoned, of obtaining absolution at their dying hour, need we wonder at the violence, insubordination, and profligacy by which the wretched population of Ireland were so generally characterized?‡

“Such was the state of the Romish church in Ireland, prior to the Reformation. The slightest consideration of its melancholy details will be sufficient to show the paramount necessity that existed for overthrowing its arrogant authority, and reclaiming it, if possible, to the purity and simplicity of the church of Christ.”

It may now be asked, why it is that we have been so diffuse in exposing the moral and religious state of Ireland from the earliest time to the period of the Reformation, and our answer is ready: because we see a likelihood of the greater part of Ireland being again submitted to the uncontrolled dominion of an anti-scriptural priesthood, and that the possible, and often heretofore effectual, reaction of Protestantism is, in all appearance, soon to be withdrawn from the popish parts of the island. We see, in the above extract from Mr. Reid's work, the domineering character of the popish priests. Is there no possibility of our countrymen being submitted again to the same haughty and overbearing intolerance? Let the conduct of the popish priest of Newport, as embodied in the petition of William Miers§ to the House of Commons, and presented last session by Mr. Finch, speak to this point. Is the grossest superstitious deference, and the most unhesitating submission to every act and saying of a priest, not likely to occur again? Alas! it is; for who forgets the recent case of Priest Carroll, in the county of Wexford, who when under the influence of a mental aberration, slaughtered, by slow degrees, an innocent baby, was believed by the surrounding multitude, and even by the weeping parents themselves, to be performing a miracle on the infant? Barbarians as they were, their faith in priestly omnipotence cast a veil even over national shrewdness, and the men of Wexford looked on the maniac and the homicide as a

legendi Hibernicum et Catechismus in eadem lingua.' 8vo. It was not till the year 1602, that the New Testament was printed in this character. See subsequent note."

* "So early as 1357, enactments were made by the Irish church to remedy the evil of non-residence, (Cox, i. 24,) an evil which has never existed in Presbyterian, nor been cured in prelatical, churches."

† "In the fourteenth century, markets were held principally on the Lord's day. Cox, i. 103."

‡ "See a shocking instance of their sacrilegious conduct recorded by Cox, i. 109."

§ See a late Number of the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

beatific THAUMATURGOS! The Irish were the slaves, before the Reformation, of bigot priests; that they are so now, and will be more so by and by, is too evident. Does the reader want an example, let him read the printed report of a recent trial of a cause between a priest, of the county Mayo, and a Protestant squire; and there he will see how he that calls himself a minister of the meek Saviour, could, with impunity, direct his flocks as dogs, and spit in the face of one of his congregation. Did the clergy, before the Reformation, abstain from preaching Christ as the sinner's only hope and refuge? Do they not deny the Gospel in the same manner still? And are not their addresses, on Sunday, to their flocks composed of objurgations respecting unpaid dues, exhortations to resistance of existing laws, electioneering excitements, denunciations against Bible readers, and threats of arbitrary and merciless excommunications against all who dare think or act for themselves? Was religion, before the Reformation, made a handle which the priesthood of Ireland wielded to effect political objects? Has it not been in the present day even more misused? Or how is it that priests have drawn poor, trembling, desponding, tenants to the hustings, and, under fear of excommunication, and the terrors of dying the death of the unabsolved, have there made them break the ties that bound landlord and tenant, and fly in the face, not only of their benefactors, but act in opposition to their best and immediate interests. If ever the power of a sin-absolving corporation, the masterpiece of Rome's policy, was exhibited on earth—if ever the power of the keys—yes, the keys of the bottomless pit—were used, it was in the return of O'Connell's tail to parliament at the last election. And will not this take place with increased effect when Popery attains its full sway, and works without a rival upon three provinces of Ireland. What influence will a Protestant proprietary have over a Popish tenantry? Or, rather, what influence will a Popish tenantry, headed by a Popish priest, have on a Protestant proprietary? Why, what else, but to force them either into a hasty and ruinous disposal of estates that are cursed with a dense mass of ignorance, wretchedness, improvidence, bigotry, and crime; or, as in many cases Protestant proprietors now do, succumb to the priest—play the liberal and the latitudinarian—discourage Protestant tenants—scoff at the Bible and Bible doctrines—abuse every pious and faithful missionary who would raise up the light of the Gospel amongst the perishing poor; and, as was done at the Newport session, pronounce, at the beck of the parish priest, that it was a crime to read the Bible on the public road; that those who did so, deserved to be ducked, and put away with pitchforks, and pronounced them to be Protestant fellows, ruffians, and public nuisances.

It may suit politicians, and even some Protestant churchmen, and even bishops, to look with tender regard on Popery, and assume that her spirit is changeable, and has changed, and that her priests may (consistently with the well-being of Ireland and her

connection with Britain) have the education of the people, exclusively committed to them; but, on the contrary, we, with the voice of history to instruct us, and our own experience to fortify our decision, pronounce that, if the clergy of the Established Church are withdrawn from the Popish parts of Ireland, there will arise such an accumulation of barbarity and disaffection amongst the people—such an overgrown and disastrous sway of foreign influenced priests, that Protestant property must be overwhelmed, and the connection with a Protestant empire be dissolved. Well and truly have the theologians of the Church of Rome asserted, that neither in her doctrines or in her policy has she ever altered.

BELFAST UNITARIAN DISCUSSION.*

WE are not disposed to regret that we have postponed delivering our views of this highly important controversy longer than, perhaps, our readers expected; because, besides being enabled to take a deliberate re-perusal of the "Report," we have now, from the pen of Mr. Carson, a "Review," in which he takes the opportunity of informing us what it ought to have been; and another by Mr. M'Afee, in which he gives us a graphic portraiture of what it was. With these advantages, we now proceed to put our readers in possession of the most material facts and circumstances connected with the "Discussion;" accompanying our statements with our "Review" of it, as well as of the "Reviews" of its reviewers, in such way as shall seem to us likely to benefit the interests of truth and godliness.

It appears that the "Discussion" arose out of a series of lectures on the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the other vital subjects of religious truth connected therewith, delivered by Mr. Bagot, in Belfast, in the end of December and beginning of January last. Belfast being considered not less the metropolis

* Authentic Report of the Discussion on the Unitarian Controversy, between the Rev. John Scott Porter, and the Rev. Daniel Bagot, M.A. Held on April 14, 1834, and three following days, in the Meeting-house of the First Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast.

Review of the Discussion on the Unitarian Controversy, between the Rev. John Scott Porter, and the Rev. D. Bagot, M.A. By Alexander Carson, A.M.

Review and Analysis of the Discussion on the Unitarian Controversy, lately held in Belfast, between the Rev. John Scott Porter, and the Rev. Daniel Bagot, A.M. By the Rev. Daniel M'Afee.

of Irish Unitarianism than the "Athens of Ulster," and Mr. Bagot not being a resident in that town, his visit for such a purpose was considered by many of the "Orthodox" as somewhat *foolhardy*, or, at least, *uncalled-for*, and by the so-called "Unitarians" as a presumptuous insult. Mr. Bagot, being a young man, and *comparatively*, at least, untried, while Belfast contained hoary and experienced veterans in the contest for the faith, it was significantly insinuated by many friends of truth, that he might as well have *let the matter alone*.

On the other hand, they whose tenets he attempted to prove to be *un-scriptural*, and *anti-scriptural*, and subversive of all solid hope, and gospel holiness, and true happiness, seemed to feel astonishment, blended with indignation, at his insolent temerity.

The result, as far as the latter were concerned, was a challenge from the Rev. John Scott Porter, a youthful Unitarian minister in Belfast, to Mr. Bagot, to meet him for the daily public discussion of the subject. Why Mr. Bagot should have been fixed on as the person to be challenged, seeing that the doctrines he advocated are no novelty to the pulpits of Belfast, either by resident ministers or occasional visitors—whether his supposed youth and inexperience seemed to promise an easy victory, or whether his being a clergyman of the now denounced establishment gave hope of depriving him of the sympathies, even of those of the audience who agreed with him in doctrinal sentiments, we know not: nor are we informed why the task devolved on Mr. Porter, a youth, while so many veterans, who had long since couched a lance in their favourite cause, and claimed the victory, were on the spot—whether he was, as is confidently asserted, the reputed Coryphæus of Unitarian talent, critical sagacity, and literary acquirements, or whether, as has also been hinted, it was deemed wiser that he should take the field, as defeat would be thus less inglorious, or whether, in the ardour and impetuosity of youthful confidence, he volunteered his services, we have not been able to ascertain. The challenge was given and accepted; the report is before the public; and the full results can be known only when "the day" shall reveal all secrets.

If undue importance has been attached to discussions of this kind, on one hand, we are quite sure that they are by many unduly undervalued on the other. Both parties, as in the present case, claim the victory; but there are candid, thinking men on both sides of the question, who will not take the assertion of either upon trust, but who will judge for themselves on which side the truth is. Now, let *one* such person, either by hearing of the discussion, or the perusal of the report of it, be brought to the deliberate and decided conviction that his previous sentiments were wrong, and that the opposite are not only true and scriptural, but essentially connected with his soul's salvation, and you have not only a convert to opinions, but an immortal spirit rescued: not only an accession to the cause of truth and holiness, but an advocate, to advance it with all the zeal and earnest-

ness, and energy, of one grateful for escape from the danger he has shunned, and filled with joy, and hope, and blessedness, through the "belief of the truth." Besides, when a man gives his whole energies, for a season, to one subject, supposing him to be possessed of powers adequate to master it, the result may naturally be expected to be the concentration of the whole truth regarding it; which must ever be of essential benefit to others.

Now, whether any, and what description of converts to the truth may have been gained by means of the discussion, we know not; but we hesitate not to assert, that a more admirable manual of the doctrine of the Bible, on the subjects in question, our junior brethren in the ministry can scarcely possess.—But to the Report:

"The following is a statement of the Propositions which constituted the subject of discussion on each side, of the standard of reference, and the rules by which the business was conducted.

"STANDARD OF REFERENCE.

"The Word of God contained in the books of the Old and New Testament, which are received into the Authorised Version, admitting them all to be canonical. The correctness or incorrectness of passages marked as spurious in Griesbach's last edition, and the translation or signification of any particular words or passages, to be open to question and legitimate criticism. The divine authority of Scripture to be admitted on both sides; and all quotations to be given in chapter and verse, according to the divisions of the Authorised Translation in common use.

"*Mr. J. S. Porter's Propositions :*

1. There is one self-existent God, the Father: who is God alone; to the entire exclusion of the alleged Proper Deity of the Word.

2. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is (even in his highest capacity, nature, or condition) a Created Being, deriving his existence, wisdom, power, and authority from the Father; and inferior to him in these and all other attributes.

Mr. Bagot's Propositions :

1. There is one God, Jehovah, who is God only, to the entire exclusion of the alleged godhead of every creature.

2. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Mediator, is the Word made flesh, perfect God and perfect man; possessing, as the Word, the same eternity, knowledge, power, authority, prerogatives, and godhead with the Father, and one with him in all attributes."

It cannot be supposed that we shall give even an outline of the arguments on either side, in a discussion which continued four days, for four hours each day; the more especially as a good deal of irrelevant and extraneous matter must, of course, be expected to have been introduced on both sides.

It was decided by lot who was to open the debate, and it fell to Mr. Porter.

Every one would naturally expect from him a positive statement of the grounds of the propositions he had undertaken to

maintain; but he who opens the Report with any expectation of the kind will be exposed to equal disappointment, as in all similar cases, when perusing the writings of the advocates of Unitarianism. Their invariable purpose seems to be to confound and perplex the subject; to prove what no one controverts, confute what no antagonist maintains, and conceal their own opinions, if they have any positive opinions on the subject, as to the real question in dispute. Hence you find them, and Mr. Porter, of course, proving that there is one God. And who denies it? But does he go on to show, from Holy Scripture, that this unity is inconsistent *with plurality, or distinction of person*? No such thing. Then, the Father is God—the one God of the Bible. And who denies it? But does he go on to show that the Son and the Spirit, as possessing the same divine nature, are not also God, the one God of the Bible? No such thing. Then, Jesus Christ is a creature—a man. Granted. Does he proceed to show that he is not also God? No such thing; and yet there is just as great an amount of clear, decided, unequivocal testimony to the latter as to the former.

Mr. Bagot adopted a course very different. He entered at once upon the proof of his propositions; and after proving, what his antagonist professed to consider needless, the unity of the Deity—but which, we conceive, should be invariably first done by every Trinitarian in similar circumstances—he proceeded to classify, by a simple and admirable arrangement, the texts of Scripture that assert the essential Deity of our blessed Lord. The remainder of the debate turned mainly, of course, on the speeches of the first day; and the texts and arguments then adduced were submitted to critical discussion and investigation. And never was there a more marked contrast than between the resources brought to the decision of a subject, and the spirit and temper in which these were employed, than in the respective combatants. Mr. Bagot excelled as much in mildness, urbanity, and good temper, as confessedly his antagonist exhibited but too prominently the petulance, violence, and impertinence, that are their opposites, while he showed himself thoroughly acquainted with all that had been said in opposition to truth on the one hand, and all that ought to be said in its defence on the other. We cheerfully, however, concede to Mr. Porter, that he made, perhaps, the best of a bad cause. He studiously avoided, in his affirmative proposition, declaring *what* he believes Jesus Christ to be—whether angel, a super-angelic spirit, or mere man, miraculously born and sinless, or born as others, and, like them, peccable and fallible; and thus he had the whole range of heresy, from Arianism to Humanitarianism, in any part of which, for the time being, to fix, as might best suit his argument or lack of argument. Then, in regard to Mr. Bagot's proofs, he positively refused even to notice them; occupying the time all the while in either personalities or the attack of what was not maintained,

or round assertions that he was right, and had beaten his opponent; while most disingenuously he reserved what he meant to be his strongholds to the last hour, when, by the arrangements, he knew Mr. Bagot would not be allowed to answer. Now, while all this is very deplorable, as indicating a spirit and temper, in a professed worshipper of truth, and of free inquiry, and candid investigation, the very reverse of what ought to exist; yet, if it must be, let it be found where heretofore it has invariably been found, in the advocate of heresy. Let candour, and meekness, and love, the love of truth and of souls, predominate as much as learning, and talent, and sound and scriptural argument. These alone are the weapons worthy of the defenders of the faith once delivered to the saints.

We have long cherished a decided conviction, that the first question to be settled with the Unitarian is *the plenary inspiration of the Bible*. It is impossible to see the mode of dealing with the Scriptures, employed by the advocates of that system, without coming to the conclusion that they do not take the Bible, simply as it is, as the word of God; nor bow to its decisions, when, by the exercise of impartial investigation, the mind of the Spirit has been ascertained as decisive of the question at issue.

The question seems never to be—what *does* any passage mean, when fairly interpreted; but what *can* it be tortured to mean so as not to oppose previously formed sentiments. Let any one contrast—and Mr. Porter's speeches will afford a good opportunity—the way in which the passages of Scripture that relate to the Father, or to any doctrine the Unitarian holds, are explained, with that in which he deals with those that assert the deity of the Son and the deity and personality of the Spirit. In the former case, all is simple, natural, obvious, and easy; in the latter case, it is not *an exposition*, but *a creed* that is extorted; as is well shown in a review of the Unitarian version of the first chapter of Hebrews, by the Vice-Chancellor of England, in his decision against the trustees of Lady Hewley's charities.*

Did the Unitarian believe in the plenary inspiration of Scripture, and admit that the mind of the Spirit, fairly ascertained, is decisive of the question, how could he resist the following challenge: As there is but one God, and as the Unitarian affirms that the Father alone is that one God, he is called upon, from Scripture, to prove, first, that the Father is a person; and, secondly, that being a person, he is God. And when he has done so, the Trinitarian engages to bring, from Holy Scripture, the same number and amount of proofs that the Holy Spirit is a divine person in deity, and that Jesus Christ is truly and essen-

* See a pamphlet entitled *Christ's Holy Gospel Vindicated, and Socinianism Exposed*, on this interesting subject.

tially God. If the Trinitarian fulfil his engagement, then will not right reason decide that while there is but one God, in the unity of Deity, there must be three persons; instead of deciding that because such a thing is previously supposed impossible, therefore, whatever Scripture may say, *it cannot be?** God has said it, therefore it is true, is the highest and noblest reason. Let men come with unbiassed minds to the Scripture, to ascertain what it teaches, and docile hearts to receive, as undoubted truth, what it reveals, instead of coming with a set of opinions supposed to be the dictates of reason, and then explaining Scripture to correspond with these; and Unitarianism will yield, as it is hastening to do, before the light and power of the truth, its expiring groan.

But we must draw these remarks to a close. We give God the glory, that Mr. Bagot has been led to discard the old mode of defending the doctrines of the Bible by attempted explanations and fancied analogies, a mode that has done more injury to the cause of truth than all its adversaries; and that he has taken the simple text of Scripture as decisive of the question. We are pleased, too, that he has met his opponent on the ground of Scripture criticism; and that his great triumph has been here, where many were wont to fancy Unitarianism, merely because of her boasting, was strong, and orthodoxy endangered. A Magee, a Pye Smith, a Wardlaw, and a Moses Stuart, had dispelled the delusion. We had noted some things with the view of animadverting on them, but they are few and not vital; and we could hardly have done this in fairness, without doing the same for his antagonist, and that would have required a book. We wish the whole subject of the Trinity, and not merely the person of Christ, had been the theme of discussion; for the adversary boasts, most groundlessly it is true, that the deity and personality of the holy Spirit are now generally given up by Trinitarians. Let the friends of truth give to the Spirit and his work a greater prominence, such as is given them in the Word of God.

Mr. Carson's book, with a good deal of dogmatism and assumption, will be found a very valuable appendix to the Report of the Discussion. There is much of the sound philosophy of Scripture criticism brought to bear on the statements and admissions of Mr. Porter; and we should think it strange if any Unitarian who had read the report, and was capable of judging in the matter, should read Mr. Carson's Review, and continue a Unitarian still. Mr. M'Affee's pamphlet, again, not only gives an analysis of the arguments and reasonings of the debates, but presents a kind

* This has been done in a recent little work entitled "The Doctrine of the Trinity, and that of the Atonement and Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, established by an Appeal to Holy Scripture."

of bird's-eye view of the discussion as it was conducted on the arena of the debate.

We repeat our recommendation that these three pamphlets, bound together, be made, by our younger brethren in the ministry, a manual, which, when mastered, the least versed in the controversy of them all, need not fear, through God's blessing, the most vaunted champion of Unitarianism—not even a Channing, a Yates, or a Drummond.

HISTORICAL PROOF OF CHRISTIANITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—It is one of the most prominent evils of these disastrous times, that the spirit of unbelief, which universal experience, no less than sacred authority, affirms to be the characteristic infirmity of mankind, seems now to have also become a chief element in the decay of national prosperity, and in the overthrow of that order of things to which use, and time, and sacred authority have given their venerable sanction.

It may not, therefore, be superfluous to awaken the attention of those whose station implies the study of history, and the knowledge of human affairs, to the evidence in favour of the Christian religion, which may be drawn from them. With this view it is here proposed to offer a slight sketch of this argument. To detail it in all its parts, and discuss all the nice questions which such a detail must involve, would be matter for a volume of no inconsiderable magnitude. But then, in fact, these details are, throughout, such as may safely be assumed as settled questions, which offer no difficulty unless to the captious opponent. To the Christian reader it may be enough to offer an outline, which he can easily fill, and which, upon a little reflection, he shall find perfectly defensible at all its points.

In all reasonings with the deist we are at liberty to assume the existence of God; and as his religion (if we may so misuse the term) is founded upon the evidence of design, observable in the physical constitution of the world, we could, from this, prove the existence of a ruling providence, and a moral design, extending to the constitution of human affairs. It would, indeed, be an advantage peculiar to the detail of this investigation, that in its full development, the evidence of design would arise with nearly the same clearness, from a full view of the moral, as from that of the physical system of the world. So far, however, the deist is usually willing to concede; and, at all events, so far is established by writers of admitted authority. Assuming, then,

for the present purpose, that there is an ultimate design in the moral constitution and providential government of the world, it is our object to prove that the Christian religion is the main principle and the immediate purpose of this design.

If such a design exist, it must have existed from the beginning of that order of things, to which it belongs; that is to say, it must have been kept in view in the creation of the world as it now exists, and from the very first ordering of the events of human history: and all the main revolutions of the social state must have been ordered with a view to its promotion. We do not mean to say, that necessarily the whole history of all the varied families of mankind must maintain this connexion—though it is probable that the most seemingly anomalous circumstances may contribute eventually to, and fall into their parts of the plan. But it is only required, for our argument, to affirm that there must be *some central line* of connected operations, in which the casual principle of the main design is preserved. We must otherwise suppose the providential design of events to have existed without purpose, or to have changed in a manner inconsistent with the admitted character of the Designer. Neither could it affect our present argument, if any one will affirm that the main design has been interrupted, by the operation of any kind of resisting principles; for such, if their existence be admitted, must also have been contemplated and provided against: we must otherwise suppose a clumsiness of contrivance inconsistent with even a very moderate degree of human wisdom. It is enough for us to assume that an original design has, from the first, been carried on; and therefore, that some chain of circumstances has so existed, as to preserve the continuity which must invariably exist in the several parts of the same complete plan. It is only thus that such a design can be conceived to exist, or, at least, to exist consistently with the idea of a progress.

If such a continuous chain of events be admitted, it seems to be a necessary inference that there must be contained through the whole, some element by which they exist as parts of the same design, and in virtue of which all things work together for the principal end. Such a condition is inseparable from the conception of purpose. And although it does not necessarily follow that such an elementary fact must be discernible to our finite perceptions: yet in this, as in all our enquiries, there are limits, within which, with due caution, we may investigate. We may, with some confidence, point out where it does not exhibit itself; and should we be enabled to discover somewhat which bears the required character, and fulfil the necessary conditions, so as to fill the place of such a principle, the ordinary rules of reason, acknowledged by all sound philosophy, must compel us to consider it as such. And though we are not able to pronounce how many, or what great elements of the universal design are concealed beyond our view, yet so far as the evidence goes, we must

acknowledge as such that which satisfies the essential conditions of a main design.

Now, with this in view, the next step should be, to search amongst all the chief events recorded in the course of history, from the beginning, whether we can discern any proof of the existence of this single element described.—Here the deist would interrupt, and allege the progress of the social state. To this the answers are many, and some of them decisive. One of these may be enough in this slight outline: the alleged principle does not in any way answer the required conditions. There is no perceptible trace of a continuous progress of the social state, reaching from the earliest records, and terminating in the present order of things. On the other hand, there is every reason to believe that such a continuity never existed for more than a few centuries at a time. The same dispositions of the mind, variously affected by circumstances, and still under the governance of the same overruling power, have brought forth various developments of the social state, having common principles; but neither connected with, nor leading to each other, though probably each highly conducive to the furtherance of some ulterior design. These social developments, commonly commencing in the midst of comparative barbarism, have mostly terminated in the same, leaving long intervals of dark periods, in which the progress of civilization has been more retarded than advanced. We freely admit that we can, throughout, trace lesser chains of event, conducting through a course of ages, to a particular constitution of society, and bearing all the characters of providential design. This, instead of enfeebling, will be found to enforce our view; for while such trains, so far establish the fact of design, they are deficient in the characters of main or ultimate design. They only enable us to grasp more firmly the clue of regulating interference; while, by their comparatively transient character, and imperfect degree of maturity, they lead us more decidedly to look for some *primary succession* of events, beyond them, to the furtherance of which they may, in some way, have contributed. Until such be found, our system must be like the Ptolemaic astronomy, according to which many appearances were ingeniously solved, and many useful facts embodied, while it was yet deficient in those principles by which it could be applied to solve all the phenomena of the system of the world.

As far as we look no further than the progress and the results of civilization, there is no reason to suppose the condition of man, *as an individual*, very materially changed for the better in comfort, health, wealth, or in any of the moral or physical enjoyments of life—we mean, not sufficiently so for the purpose of an opponent—nor have we any reasonable ground to look for such in the future. And if such a prospect can be proved to exist, it will be still easier to prove that it is recent in its origin; and therefore still but referable to some ulterior design contained in the uniform structure of the whole.

Since, then, there cannot be formed in these transient, unconnected, and incomplete trains of event, any distinct character of a main or permanent purpose, the question remains—Is there any connected train of circumstances, which observably fulfils this condition, by its traceable connection with the main current of human history, throughout its whole duration?

We answer, without hesitation, that there is one only chain, which has run, without any ascertainable interruption, throughout all recorded history, and which offers unimpaired evidence of an unbroken continuity of purpose, throughout, from the first act of disobedience, to the latest acts of spoliation—from the early record of the murder of a servant of God, to the modern report of a British debate on his church, there is one well marked and authentic series of records, indicating a chain of connected events and institutions, always progressing onward with events, and alike influencing and influenced by all the greater revolutions of all ages. It is scarcely necessary to add, that we mean the continuous series of divine institutions which are contained in the record of the Scripture—the religion of Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, and St. Paul, and the Protestant Church of England, indissolubly connected in one history, and by the one expressed principle recognized throughout, as well as by their explicit relations and references to each other; constituting altogether, the same integral whole; and that whole so related to the main history of human events from the beginning, as to give to the greater revolutions of the world a character which, without it, they could not have.

This system alone is connected with the entire scheme of human affairs, and gives to all their revolutions a character of unity which they would not, without it, possess. On this alone, all the greater changes have obviously effected the purpose for which they were probably designed; and having done so, utterly disappeared. This alone, when nations, with their knowledge, opinions, manners, language, and all, save the very common characters of human nature, have passed away into the oblivion of untraceable ruins, and undecipherable manuscripts—this alone, permanent as nature, has been found standing; however shaken, still entire in its essentials, and ready, with unabated power, to take its commanding position in the new, as it held its place of power in the old.

Without this, it would be utterly impossible to discern a sign of moral plan; unless by the aid of that vain philosophizing by which any desired conclusion may be inferred from any grounds. Amongst the numberless and varied systems of the mind, and amongst the mighty constitutions of law and polity which have pursued each other into confusion, there is nothing that has lasted, or is framed to last. But when the history of the religion of the Bible is observed in all the breadth of its entire design, existing along the whole course of time, mingling with and influencing

its greatest changes; and, without losing its essential character, yet, in its own gradations, wonderfully preserving an adaptation to the coming order of things, and this with a precision not within the power of human foresight to preserve. Then, indeed, we must abandon our reason, not to see in its antiquity, its prominence, and universal instrumentality, the true character of a ruling principle and fundamental purpose in the dispensations of Providence.

Neither is it merely because it appears as the only permanent principle in the revolutions of human affairs, that we would draw this inference, but because, in effect, the actual working of all such revolutions has been to forward the progress of the religion of the Scripture through some of its stages; this has been their effect, and ultimately their sole effect of any permanence; so much so, indeed, that it would be easy to make it appear that the greater events of Judaism and Christianity have been uniformly preceded by a succession of revolutionary movements in the world, the combined effect of which was to prepare the way for them; thus showing, in very marked characters, that the religion of Scripture is, as it professes to be, from Him who orders all things for his own purposes.

Thus, it appears to be the beginning and ending of all things; and, while nothing else remains through the changes of time, is still seen unchangeably guiding and enlightening the steps of the faithful of all ages, through the tempest and confusion of passing things.

J. U. U.

THOUGHTS ON MEMORY AND HOPE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—I am aware that your publication is not intended for the discussion of questions of a purely metaphysical or speculative nature; and I should be most unwilling that it should lose its exclusively religious character by becoming so. The following observations, however, are so intimately connected with a subject which has been already brought before the attention of your readers, and are indeed so necessary to a full elucidation of it, that, upon that account, I trust you will not refuse them a place in your pages.

In a former communication I suggested a method of accounting for the illusions of memory and hope; and as the solution there proposed appeared to some, whose opinion I respect, superficial and false, I was led to consider it with more attention. The result of this reconsideration was, a confirmed persuasion of its soundness and its truth; and I proceed to lay before you the reflections which seemed to warrant this conviction.

It is, I conceive, a universal law of human nature, that the desire of possessing any good has a tendency to produce a belief that we have actually attained to it. In many cases this belief is so obviously at variance with facts which force themselves upon our observation, that the corresponding desire fails to produce its natural effect. A beggar, for example, may desire wealth and luxury; but his threadbare garments and craving appetite are facts too stubborn to yield to the delusions of imagination. A man of low estate may sigh after regal pomp; but, should self-delusion carry him so far as to make him sway an imaginary sceptre, irresistible evidence is at hand to undeceive him.

Vellunt tibi barbam

Laecivi pueri; quos tu nisi fuste coërces,

Urgere turbâ circum te stante, miserque

Rumperis, et latras, magnorum maxime regum!

But, whenever the object of our desire is such as that imagination can put us in possession of it, unrefuted by the incontrovertible demonstration of actual perception, we readily lend ourselves to the illusion. Whence proceeds, I ask, the overweening estimation of themselves which men in general entertain? How happens it that we, for the most part, think ourselves more wise, more learned, more witty, more gifted, than we actually are? Why does each individual attribute to himself a greater perfection, moral, intellectual, and physical, than in truth belongs to him? And why, above all, does he think himself possessed in a superlative degree, of those very attainments in which he is

most desirous to excel? What, in short, is the origin of the delusions of vanity, self-conceit, and inordinate self-esteem? I know not how to answer these questions but by admitting the principle already laid down, that the desire of possessing any advantage has a tendency to produce a belief that we have really attained to it; and that this persuasion is actually felt, when not palpably falsified by opposing facts.

Can we doubt that, if men became as ambitious to appear ignorant, illiberal, and dastardly, as they are now solicitous to be thought learned, polite, and brave, self-delusion would accommodate itself to these newly-implanted desires? In those countries where black teeth and white hair are esteemed ornamental to the women, who can doubt that the deceptions of female vanity adapt themselves to the prevailing taste? If, then, we are inclined to overrate ourselves with respect to certain acquirements and accomplishments; and, if those acquirements and accomplishments are precisely those which we are most desirous to possess, how shall we escape the conclusion, that this belief in imaginary attainments is wholly the result of the attractions by which these objects influence our desire?

This theory derives no small confirmation from the proneness which we feel to invest those whom we strongly love with perfections wholly the offspring of our own fancy. How many virtues and talents, invisible to less partial eyes, does an indulgent parent discover in a darling child! What slender data are there in *Rerum naturâ* wherefrom to deduce the existence of all the ideal perfections with which a lover's fancy adorns the object of his affections! It is our desires which are able thus far to impose upon our credulity: we believe, because we are willing to believe. If, then, this principle so greatly influence the opinions which we entertain of those we love, how strongly must it operate with respect to the judgments which we form regarding ourselves! If friendship and affection unfit us for giving an unbiassed verdict upon the case of others, how will self-love permit us to pronounce upon ourselves with the impartiality of an unconcerned spectator?

From the foregoing observations it appears to me evident, that there is in the human mind a tendency to imagine itself in possession of those advantages which it covets to attain. Why are we not as apt to think too meanly, as too highly, of ourselves? Is there not as much ground, in the nature of things, for the one opinion as for the other? It is self-love which produces certain desires; and these desires influence our belief.

This principle operates in a variety of ways, suitable to the infinite diversity of men's tastes and wishes. But if in one taste and one wish all men are agreed, the principle which I have endeavoured to establish would lead us to expect a widely spread delusion, consequent upon, and coextensive with this universal desire. In one taste all mankind are in perfect unison: all men desire happiness; and the delusion, resulting from this desire, is

to be found, I conceive, in the deceptive attractions of memory and hope. We are all desirous of happiness; and the principle for which I contend requires in us a tendency to attribute to ourselves this object of our wishes. This tendency does actually exist, but is unable to operate whilst present perception is at hand to dissipate its illusions: we cannot think ourselves happier than we feel ourselves to be. Its influence, therefore, can extend only to the past and to the future: more limited in the former case, where recollection, though obscured by time, in some degree checks the extravagance of its fictions, than in the latter, where it expatiates unrestrained in the boundless field of possibility and conjecture.

As the truth of this doctrine will perhaps be more readily admitted in reference to the illusions of hope, than as it respects the deceptions of memory, I will briefly consider it in its latter application. There is in our minds a principle which leads us to associate the idea of happiness with ourselves, whereby any scene of which we form a part, when suggested to our thoughts, brings along with it the idea of happiness, whenever this connexion is not dissevered by irresistible counter evidence. Hence, when memory pictures to the mind some former passage of our lives, it colours its representation with the superadded hues of imaginary happiness, in so far as distinct remembrance is unable to unmask the deception.

The truth of these considerations will perhaps appear more clear to us if we bear in mind, that the power of the imagination is quite as great in forming unpleasing, as in producing agreeable images. In reference, therefore, to the objects of remembrance and anticipation, what influence induces it to exercise the latter, rather than the former power? What principle determines it to dip its creative pencil in gay, rather than in sombre colours?

Should this method of accounting for the phenomena of memory and hope be objected to as superficial, because it refers them to a law which itself requires explanation, I admit that it does so. But if the explanation of a fact be superficial, because it traces it to a law, the cause of which is unknown, I know not a solution, within the range of mental and material science, which can escape the charge. There is, I allow, an infinite gradation in point of comprehensiveness among these laws, from those which are applicable only to a comparatively small number of facts, to those ultimate and fundamental ones which form the limit of human science; and, the more general the law to which we refer a fact, the greater is our progress in knowledge. But, in tracing a fact to *any* law, we advance a stage, be it greater, or be it less.

Were I inclined to speculate farther upon this subject, it would not be difficult, I think, to assign at least a plausible solution of the law, the existence of which I have endeavoured to demonstrate. It is the opinion of our best modern metaphysicians,

that the pictures which imagination presents to the mind are accompanied by a momentary persuasion of their reality. When, however, as is for the most part the case, the truth of these representations is obviously inconsistent with fact, the delusive belief which attends them quickly vanishes, and leaves no abiding impression on the mind. If this be true, it seems natural to suppose that, in proportion as these imaginary combinations are less palpably falsified, the credit which we attach to them will be less evanescent.

To apply this principle to our present case. Imagination is constantly picturing us to ourselves in possession of the objects of our desires. When these fanciful representations are clearly irreconcilable with the reality of things, we recognize them as fictions of the imagination: whilst, when this inconsistency is less apparent the delusive belief is cherished, and begets a permanent conviction in the mind.

Fully to develop the application of this principle would, however, require a length of discussion, inconsistent with the narrow space which such a subject should occupy in your pages.

G. H. W.

THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM.*

THIS little pamphlet is the production of the able pen of the author of "Eruvin," and of a book on the Twelve Hundred and Sixty Days; in plain language, of the Rev. Mr. Maitland, of Gloucester; and though short, the temper with which it is written, and the mode of warfare of which he has made choice, are very creditable to him. Its character is strictly defensive, and its object is to show, that our much-abused church is not more obnoxious to evil management than the chapels under the voluntary system; nay, that exposed as we are to the actings of human corruption, *they* are infinitely less provided with "guards and guarantees." Most of our readers are probably aware, that within the last few years a most violent attack—persecution we think it might be called—has been carried on against the church, especially touching the loaves and fishes; all, no doubt, from a simple desire for her spiritual purification. It grieves the hearts of these upright "Volunteers" that men, so holy as her functionaries ought to be, should be burdened with secularities; and they are kindly anxious to relieve their shoulders of this weight.

But how have these so calumniated men acted under such baseless provocations? Thank God, precisely as Christian men and Christian ministers ought. They have taken refuge in silence—in meekness and quietness they have "kept the even" but most laborious "tenor of their way;" "hiding under the shadow of his wing," until "this indignation be overpast!" This, doubtless, was the wisest plan, so long as their enemies confined themselves to the mere circulation of slander: but now that these accusations are brought forward as weighty facts in support of the universal adoption of their new "Voluntary System," some answer, merely defensive, is due. If the church is to be pulled down by the violent—if no associations of reverence with an institution, amongst whose pillars may be enumerated, Jewel, Latimer, Cranmer, Leighton, and a host "of whom the world was not worthy," suffice to stay the work of spoliation, we can only pray for grace to say, "Thy will be done." But surely, let this work of ruin proceed (if it be inevitable) on the sure grounds of adequate evidence: let it be proved, at least, as Mr. M. observes, not that the Church of England is *not perfect*; for no humanly conducted institution can be that; but that the system to be substituted for it, will work—has worked—does work better. This

* The Voluntary System. Part I. By a Churchman.

is precisely the object of these "Six Letters," called forth by some shallow remarks of a Mr. Burder, of Stroud, published in the *Gloucester Journal*.

The first letter is occupied with an answer to Mr. B.'s demand for the "guarantee" of a capacity, or fitness, of candidates for the church ministry; in which, after showing the trials through which they must pass, the testimonials they must produce, the public reading of the *Si quis*, and the bishop's appeal in the ordination service, he, fairly enough, demands what are the *increased safeguards* amongst Dissenters:

"There is nothing in their system," he observes, "to prevent any man from getting his license, without any examination as to his fitness, and when thus furnished, he may begin to preach when, and where, and what he pleases, to any body that will hear him. I apprehend that there are but few Dissenting ministers who were educated with a view to that office, who did not enter the pulpit at an earlier (many at a much earlier) age than they could have obtained deacon's orders. Nay, perhaps Mr. Burder may have known such a case (if he does not I do) as a raw student being sent out to preach, before he had been six weeks at the academy, in order that he might get something towards his maintenance in it."

Mr. Burder takes great offence at an advertisement of Mr. Wallis's, purporting that he transacts various clerico-secular business, such as the "purchase, sale, or exchange of advowsons, next presentations, perpetual curacies, Episcopal chapels, &c." He is virtuously indignant at such vile trafficking; but in the triumph of convicting the church of these flagrant doings, he has quite overlooked the hidden meaning of the little &c., which, from some "parallel passages," on the cover of the "Evangelical Magazine," appears to refer to the sale of "Meeting-houses," entrusted to Mr. Wallis's charge. But to come to the illustration itself, which Mr. B. seems strangely to misunderstand, as though,

"Mr. Wallis could, (for a consideration,) pop any one into a snug place of preferment with as much ease and unconcern as a waterman ushers a fare into a hackney coach."

Patronage is much on the same footing in the church and among Dissenters; *i. e.*, you may buy a presentation or a chapel, and become, in either case, a patron. But here the similarity ends.—Let us hear Mr. M.:

"When you come to exercise your patronage, you will find they differ widely. If you have acquired the power to appoint to a specific charge in the church, you must look for your nominee among a certain body of men who have been solemnly set apart to the service of the church, and who must have been twice, at least, under episcopal examination; and when from this body you have selected an individual, he must again be submitted to the bishop, for approval, before he can be appointed to the specific charge. You will also bear in mind, Sir, that if, directly or indirectly, you make any

pecuniary bargain with this person, or with any of his friends, or even if it can be proved that there was some pecuniary bargain for his appointment, of which both you and he were ignorant, his appointment to the specific charge would be void. When, however, you have presented, and the bishop has approved and instituted, your nominee steps into the pulpit with the freedom which should characterise an Englishman, a Protestant priest, and, above all, a minister of the Gospel. He is not your creature. He is, in a much more proper sense than many who call themselves so, an *independent* minister; and if (pardon my supposing such a case possible) he should feel it his duty to rebuke you for any irreligious or immoral practices, you cannot stop his tongue or turn him out. If, on the other hand, you should buy Ebenezer Chapel, or any other Dissenting Meeting-house that Mr. Wallis may have to dispose of; or, failing to find one that you like, you should have set the builder to work, as you may do in any parish, without saying "by your leave," to any body; if, in short, somehow or other, you have become the patron of a Dissenting Meeting, you may, if you please, preach there yourself, and let your pews at whatever price you can get. You may also preach what you will; and, if you choose to give your hearers on the Sunday, a second edition of what you give your readers on the Saturday, there is nothing to hinder you, unless it be any doubt of the expediency of the thing.

"On that point you must judge for yourself, bearing in mind that your own good pleasure, and the taste of your audience are the things, and the only things to be attended to; and that, (to borrow the language of the 'Christian Advocate' advertisement,) if you would have 'lucrative advantages,' your chapel must be under a 'well-conducted proprietorship.' If, however, you modestly think that some one else may be more useful, either to you or to the congregation, you may select him from what rank of life you please, and make the best bargain you can with him; and, if he does not give satisfaction, you may turn him out and get another.

"If Mr. Wallis (supposing him to be still in existence, for I know him only from this famous advertisement) should not be able to furnish you with any person who would undertake such a charge, I can tell you where you may find plenty of advertisements from Dissenting ministers, who want employment; and if you should not be able to agree with any of them, you must send to one of the academies for a student to 'supply.'"

This extract will sufficiently show the spirit of this little work; and, we trust, induce many to purchase it. It ought to be in the hands of every lover of the church, and of all whose minds are wavering. The author next considers the "sale of livings," so reprobated by Mr. Burder. That, on both sides, such sales do take place, and "for the highest prices" which can be gotten, is unquestionable: there is this difference, however:

"Namely, that the church must still remain what it was, and can only be used for those purposes for which it was built, endowed, and consecrated. It is impossible for a lay speculator to withdraw from a neighbourhood

those means of grace to which they have been accustomed, by converting a place of worship to any secular purpose. The seller cannot advertise in such terms as these :

“ CHAPEL.

“ To be let, or sold, terms moderate, a well-built, neat Chapel, with ground for enlargement. No galleries. Will seat near two hundred persons. Situation, Stockwell, Surrey. Immediate possession. *May be converted into anything else.* Apply, &c. &c.—*Evangelical Magazine* for May, 1830.”

This is not the only instance given. Just stress is laid upon the continuance of divine service without a day's intermission, in case of vacancies in church livings; and deplorable instances adduced of the contrary “in the Interest.” Curacies may be heard of at Mr. Wallis's, and “meetings” are advertised as wanting ministers: curates apply to Mr. W. for cures, and Dissenting ministers advertise for congregations, with the advantage of stipulating for salary, and of losing nothing by being their own “trumpeters.” *Exempli gratia* :

“ A minister of the Congregational denomination is open to an invitation from a pious peaceable Church, who can raise from £80 to £100 per ann. He is a *truly devout man*, and has been a *faithful, zealous, and successful* minister of the Gospel above twenty years.—For further particulars, address for A. B., &c. &c.—*Evan. Mag.* for May, 1832.”

Further, Mr. Wallis “raises money on livings, or tithes, by mortgage or annuity,” and the “Interest” borrow money on security of their “chapels.”

Mr. W. procures “pupils and tuitions,” and Dissenters announce “scholastic agency on Christian principles.”—See Mr. Burk's advertisement in *Evan. Mag.* for Sept. 1830.

So far the parallels are pretty even: certainly it would be difficult to prove their leaning towards the Dissenting system; and now Mr. Maitland advances a step further, and taking for his *text* Mr. James of Birmingham's assertion, “Let the *voluntary principle* have room, and you will have the *world redeemed*, and the *church harmonized*,” and for his *illustration*, the scene lately enacted at the tabernacle, Moorfields, he proceeds to inquire into the probable operation of this “Voluntary principle,” if universally established; but as the whole of his argument is not yet before us, we shall defer entering upon this part of the subject until the Second Part of the work is published. We cannot take leave of Mr. Maitland without expressing our thankfulness that the subject should be taken up by one so clear-headed, and so sober-minded. We trust he will proceed in detail with his labour; and if our friends the Dissenters (many of whom we personally admire and love) would take a hint from us, we would recommend for their adoption the candour and fairness, the good humour and *gentlemanliness* which are so strikingly exhibited in the publication before us.

KNOX AND JEBB'S CORRESPONDENCE.*

(Continued from page 642.)

WE must now pass on far more rapidly through the remainder of this correspondence. We must omit all notice of many letters calling for different degrees of approbation and disapprobation; but we cannot pass by what we consider a most false and unfounded view of the origin of sacrifice, which we find in a letter of Mr. Jebb, dated Cashel, Dec. 3, 1808:

"In the course of our conversation Capt. — happened to observe, that the Unitarian views, on the subject of atonement, appeared to him more consistent with divine benevolence than the orthodox opinion. This naturally led to a statement of *our* way of thinking; embracing the consideration, both of God's moral government, as providing for the well-being of innumerable orders of intelligences, and of his gracious accommodation of the great scheme, to the wants and weaknesses of man. My mode of talking on this latter topic I wish to submit to you, for the purpose of knowing whether it accords with what I have heard, and I would hope, imbibed from you.

"I laid it down as a principle, that, wherever the good God adopts, or permits a mode of procedure that may, at first view, seem productive of evil, it is for the purpose of keeping out some worse evil. This being premised, I argued, from a variety of circumstances, but especially from the universal prevalence of sacrifice, and the frequent occurrence of human sacrifice, that there exists in human nature a deep principle, or feeling of superstition; a perturbed dread of some superior, powerful, and most vindictive being: no matter whence this feeling, at first, derived its origin, it clearly is in man. This being the case, was it not worthy of the supreme wisdom of a supremely benignant Being, to make provision for the ultimate extirpation of this superstitious horror, as well as for giving it the least injurious direction possible, till things were ripe for the great remedy? And what can be conceived more adapted to this twofold purpose than the fact of the atonement, and the preparative institution of sacrifice?

"Sacrifice, among the patriarchs, was of divine appointment. In after times it passed, at the great dispersion, from the patriarchal posterity, to the different nations. And whilst, among the Jews, it received peculiar modifications from the law of God himself, we find, that among the more civilized

* Thirty Years' Correspondence, between John Jebb, D.D. F.R.S., Bishop of Limerick, Ardfer, and Aghadoc, and Alexander Knox, Esq. M.R.I.A. Edited by the Rev. Charles Forster, B.D., Perpetual Curate of Ash next Sandwich: formerly Domestic Chaplain to Bishop Jebb.—London: James Duncan, 37, Paternoster-row; and John Cochran, 108, Strand. 1834.

Gentiles, animal sacrifice afforded the great vent, or outlet, to that superstition, which would, otherwise, have internally preyed upon individuals, and produced horrors, from the very imagination of which the heart recoils. Among people less civilized, or rather more savage, the frightful malignity of the superstitious principle was evinced by human sacrifice; by the most unnatural and atrocious of all human sacrifices, 'the fruit of their bodies, for the sin of their souls.' And by this we are given to see what superstition might, nay probably what it must have led to, not merely in exempt cases, but in a most numerous class of minds, had it not been for the divine expedient of animal sacrifice.

"But not to speak of typical purposes, this further end was answered, that the fears of men—of Gentiles, no less than Jews—having been taught to move in this direction; to vent themselves, if I may so speak, through the channel of sacrifice, the world was thus prepared for the reception of that great fact, the sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ: a fact which was, from the first, designed to be the great remedy for superstition; the ultimate exterminator of all such horrors as shock us in the volumes of *Cæsar*, the annals of Mexico, and the living manners of Hindostan. A fact, which, wherever its belief has obtained, has not failed of producing this blessed effect; and which, in the nature of things, must be universal in its operation, inasmuch as it is 'one full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world.'

"By thus putting the case, I conceive one objection is anticipated. It might have been urged, 'You say, the atonement has prevented a recurrence to human sacrifice. But, did not human sacrifice arise out of animal sacrifice; which your most orthodox divines not only admit, but argue to have been of divine appointment?' To this I reply, granted. But, besides that human sacrifice is the abuse of an institution, originally merciful, it serves only to show, in their utmost deformity, the deep malignity, and the atrocious effects of superstition. That is, in other words, it lets us see to what enormities the whole class of superstitious men—assuredly, a very large proportion of the human race—would have resorted for their relief from a state of most perturbed anxiety, had not some expedient been devised: whilst the wise choice, and the happy success of the expedient actually employed, are abundantly evinced by the great prevalence of animal sacrifice, not only among Jews, but among Gentiles: and whilst we cannot but admire the fitness of this system to prepare the feelings of mankind for the reception of that grand fact, which will finally cut up superstition by the roots. It remains only to notice the wonderful fitness of the fact itself, to counteract the evil at its utmost height. For, if men thought it needful 'to sacrifice their sons and daughters,' 'God, also, has spared not his [own son.]"

We scarcely know whether we have ever met with any thing, on this subject, more objectionable, more unorthodox than these sentiments. We have never read any thing more derogatory to the great doctrine of sacrifice—all, we fear, arising from the fundamental error of these men on the subject of the atonement of

our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; from giving it a place in their scheme, far below that which it holds in the religion of the Bible. Mr. Jebb, as we have seen in the foregoing extract, appeals to Mr. Knox as to whether his sentiments accord with what he has heard, and he hopes imbibed from him. We have, in the following letter, Mr. Knox's answer, which we conceive to be as unsatisfactory as Mr. Jebb's first statement. We grieve to see these worthy men assisting to bind down each other in error upon such important subjects. We give Mr. Knox's reply:

"You have given me, in your late letters, several interesting things to advert to; but I must touch but briefly on any of them. I like all you say, about atonement and sacrifices; in fact, it is all what I think, except merely, that I feel myself at a loss, as to the *manner* of their appointment, (*i. e.* of sacrifices.) That some intimation gave rise to them, I am sure; but what degree of distinctness was in that intimation, I do not know. For example, I know not that Cain's offering would have had any fault in it if he had done well: that is, I know not that the bloodlessness was any defect. It strikes me as possible, that man *might* have conceived the first thought of sacrifices; and that divine condescension might have recognized and sanctioned the practice in the upright; while the devil perverted, and abused it in the evil. I cannot think that any mere appointment could account for a universal custom. It must be natural, I conceive, if universal. I own, however, that its being natural no more contradicts its being appointed, than the fifth commandment contradicts the reality of natural gratification. But in that case the appointment is rather like our declaratory laws than a positive institution. (I am using unnecessary words, but I hope you will catch at my meaning.) In short, I think it possible that perturbation of conscience took a kind of natural vent in that way, and that hence came the appointment, as well as the universal usage; instead of the universal usage coming from the appointment. One thing, amongst others, which leads me to this supposition is, the depreciating language in which God speaks of sacrifices on various occasions: though I own, at this instant, an answer occurs to this remark; to wit, that new moons and sabbaths, clearly positive institutions, are spoken of with like depreciation. Therefore, it follows that if the external act be not accompanied by the internal disposition, the former may be alike depreciated, whether spontaneous, or instituted. Still, my chief reason holds good; the insufficiency of mere institution to account for universal practice; at the same time, I pretend not to be positive as to the actual origination."

We shall venture to say, that if these able, thinking men, had seen the prominent place which the atoning sacrifice of the Lord Jesus holds in the religion of the Bible, had they seen how it was looked forward to by those who lived before the coming of Christ, as well as looked back to, by those who have lived since his coming, they would not have been at such a loss to account for the origin of sacrifice.

We have a letter from Mr. Knox, dated Jan. 31, 1809, which will throw much light upon his views of the atonement, how far he received it, and how far he set little value on it, which we give to our readers :

" A passage in Watts, which I wish you to look at, is in the third of the essays, annexed by way of appendix, to 'The Ruin and Recovery,' &c. Works, vol. iii. p. 542 ; second paragraph of the essay. To me these few lines seem to contain much important matter. Observe first, the account of the real evil of sin. It is well called real evil ; for, if this were gone, what could harm ? If this be not gone, what can benefit ? In a word, I think the statement a right sound one ; the result of a good moral taste, and a distinctive mind. But observe further, how he defines the relative evil of sin : its chief matter, actions, rather than principles ; (though stated to be so, rather than in contradiction to the immediately preceding sentence ;) its opposite, not God's nature, but God's law ; and its consequences, not natural, but positive inflictions. I cannot give the doctor the same credit for distinctness here. But, when persons leave what is natural, and betake themselves to what is positive, where they can have no aid from analogy, no clue, but figurative, and consequently vague language, what can they do ?

" I do not mean to deny that the general ideas may be substantively just : and take it altogether, I think it a fair definition, as far as definition can be relied on in the case ; and it especially serves a useful purpose, associated with the foregoing definition. For, on laying them together, is it not clear that the real evil of sin is intrinsic to our nature ; and the relative evil of sin extrinsic ; and that, therefore, the former alone is strictly moral ; and the latter merely political. Yet, you observe it is respecting the relative evil, that he makes the atonement efficacious ; while he ascribes the removal of the real evil exclusively to sanctification by the Holy Spirit.

" Now, in this view, what is there in the removal of the relative evil of sin, which we cannot conceive done once for all, by the propitiatory intercession of our Redeemer, as really and consistently, as for each individual penitent ? Nay, set aside only particular redemption ; grant once, that our Saviour died for all ; and does it not follow, that the relative evil is as much removed from them *collectively* as it can be, until the real evil is removed *individually* ? Is not the offer of mercy, or more clearly, is not the visible operation and progress of a morally meliorative plan in the world, a direct and irrefragable evidence that mankind is collectively delivered from the gripe of a punitive law, and that another state of things, irrepulsive, gracious, infinitely attractive, now prevails ?

" Only take the black bar of Calvinism out of the way, and this seems to me to follow from Dr. Watts' statement by inevitable consequence. For law must not be departed from but on principle. But it is departed from, (supposing his notion of it was just,) respecting the whole human race. For ' God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses.' Nay, it is more than departed from, for a plan opposite to that of punishment, a remedial and sanative plan, is steadily

going forward, to the present happiness of individuals, and in sure and certain hope respecting the mass: therefore Christ's sacrifice is, here, fully available; it has done all it could do; and consequently resistance to, and deliverance from the real evil of sin is now the one thing needful.

"Unfortunate is he whose trust in the other [deliverance from the relative evil of sin] leads him to overlook [the deliverance from its real evil;] and pitiable is he whose concentrated attention to this is disturbed by speculative anxieties about the other.

"I dispute not but that the other may have in it real fact. The universe is wide, and has, probably, a permanent nursery department. Here, law may be the indispensable instrument of manuduction. Hooker's view, which I admired (before I knew better) without bound, may have some foundation. But it is something better than law, whose voice is the harmony of the world. Yet where law speaks it must not be gainsaid; and nothing must be suffered absolutely discordant with its tones. I find no difficulty, therefore, in believing that our Saviour provided against every possible embarrassment of this nature; and in believing this, I conceive I subscribe to the substance of Watts's notion respecting relative evil; though perhaps in a more intelligible way than he might have done himself. Is this topic, then, to be dwelt upon? In one case, I think it is; where a person doubts whether God will hear him. If there be such doubt, I humbly conceive the less it is dwelt upon the better; inasmuch as it is a fact, which our thinking of can make no surer; and which was really done that we might not think of it primarily, but of the end for which it was done. When we have thought of this latter to purpose, we shall know better how to think about the other."

Here we have from Mr. Knox admission of the relative evil or guilt of sin, and atonement as its remedy; and we rejoice in this admission, as that without which we could not receive him as a Christian brother: but then it is but bare admission, with every thing that can be said to depreciate its value, and to assist in turning away the mind from the contemplation of it. There is one peculiarly strange passage towards the conclusion of the foregoing extract:

"Is this topic to be dwelt upon? In one case I think it is; where a person doubts whether God will hear him. If there be such doubt, I humbly conceive the less it is dwelt upon the better; inasmuch as it is a fact which our thinking of can make no surer."

There is something very obscure, and hard to be understood, in this passage; but as far as we understand it, we cannot but highly disapprove of it. The remedy for the guilt of sin provided by the Saviour, is a topic which is to be dwelt upon only in one case, and the less dwelt upon the better!! This, surely, is strange theology. This, surely, ill accords with St. Paul's determination to know nothing amongst the people but Jesus Christ, and him crucified.

As we have, in fidelity, been obliged to insert extracts of which we disapprove, and to state our disapproval, we have the more satisfaction in laying before our readers a few lines written by Mr. Jebb, in a season of dispiriting languor; they set before us a sweet and pious spirit; though they, as well as every thing else coming from the same school, may be charged with much defect:

“ O Thou, whose all enlivening ray
Can turn my darkness into day,
Disperse, great God, my mental gloom,
And with thyself my soul illumine.
Though gathering sorrows swell my breast,
Speak but the word, and peace and rest
Shall set my troubled spirit free
In sweet communion, Lord, with thee.
What though, in this heart-searching hour,
Thou dim'st my intellectual power;
The gracious discipline I own,
And wisdom seek at thy blest throne:
A wisdom, not of earthly mould,
Not such as learned volumes hold,
Not selfish, arrogant, and vain,
That chills the heart, and fires the brain:
But, Father of eternal light,
In fixt and changeless glory bright,
I seek the wisdom from above,
Pure, peaceful, gentle, fervent love!
Let love divine my bosom sway,
And then my darkness will be day;
No doubts, no fears, shall heave my breast,
For God himself will be my rest!”

There is not much in the remainder of the volume which, after the very large extracts we have given, we can now afford to transcribe, though there is a very excellent letter, but, unfortunately for us, a very long one, from Mr. Knox, dated March 8, 1809, in which he goes much at length against the idea that our love of God should entirely exclude every idea of benefit to self. We could not do justice to the subject by any extracts we could make. Though we think our two authors more nearly approaching, in their religion, to mysticism than to any other system, there are here and there some excellent things against the errors of the mystics.

The sermons to be preached by Mr. Jebb afforded a very large share, as we have seen, of the materials for the correspondence between these two friends. Mr. Jebb often asked Mr. Knox to suggest to him a text and accompany it with some hints as to the mode of handling it. He did so at the end of the year 1809, in the prospect of preaching a sermon for the

Magdalen Asylum, and his friend suggested to him John viii. 11, "And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee; go, and sin no more," and gave about three pages of hints, which he expanded into a sermon, afterwards published in his volume of sermons. We notice this in order to draw attention to the editor's note, (we think a very silly one):

"'Sermons on Subjects chiefly Practical;' Sermon X.; the most highly wrought of all the bishop's discourses. The editor possesses the original draughts of the exordium; which was transcribed, if his recollection serves, at least thirty times, before his friend felt satisfied with the effect; it being his object to make this discourse a model for himself, and a specimen of the capabilities of the English language, for rhythmical composition.—Ed."

We cannot help saying, what an injudicious panegyric of a blind friend! We were no strangers to the sermon; we had read it many years ago with some pleasure; but we never dreamed of its being "a model for himself, and a specimen of the capabilities of the English language for rhythmical composition."!! We have opened the volume again, and whilst we allow the classic correctness of the style, and the beauty of some of the thoughts, we see nothing to justify such fulsome praise. But we cannot but ask what is this rhythmical composition, of which the editor says it is so eminent a specimen? We think it good, plain, well-written prose. We see in the sermon some pleasing philosophy, rather a scantiness of Christianity, but nothing at all of poetry or rhythm. And does the editor really think that it is to Mr. Jebb's praise, either as a writer or a minister, to have it said of him, that he transcribed the exordium at least thirty times? Was it to his praise as a writer that he found such labour necessary to clothe his thoughts, or rather his friend's thoughts, in correct language? Was it to his praise as a minister that he spent so much time in seeking the excellency of speech, and of man's wisdom? Would not this note rather leave upon the reader the impression that Mr. Jebb was more anxious to preach himself than Christ Jesus the Lord? This, surely, is not the kind of preparation which a Christian minister should make for the pulpit, spending so much time and labour upon the mere polishing of the style. The very mention of such a thing is calculated to do harm, by driving zealous, single-hearted young men, through disgust, into the very opposite extreme of crude, or unprepared preaching.

The closing letter of this volume makes known Mr. Jebb's preferment to the valuable living of Abington. We shall let him state, in his own language, his views on his present change of circumstances:

"The archbishop probably told you of the living of Abington being now mine. It is worth, I believe, £1000 per ann., with an incomparable house, &c., (for which I must pay smartly.) But what delights me is the situation. It is sufficiently near Cashel, (twenty-four miles,) to admit of occa-

sional visits, for a few days at a time; and sufficiently remote, to leave me a free agent. It sends me to act in a new sphere; when, perhaps, my occupation was almost gone in the present. It constitutes me a sort of centre to the diocese of Emly; and it places me within nine miles of Limerick. Who can tell, but that some providential purpose may be answered, by my being brought into the sphere of a great city; already the theatre of theological disputes; where Calvinism is incipient; and where the opponents of Calvinism may possibly receive some indoctrination? I wish not to be sanguine, but odd presentiments have occurred to me, and I know not whether I should, with equal satisfaction, view my advancement to any other preferment in his grace's gift."

As we were unable to give Mr. Knox's long letter in Vol. I., on the subject of mysticism, we have the more pleasure in giving a short one from one of the early letters in Vol. II.:

"I will not attempt to write a long letter, for at this moment I am engaged in one of my voluminous ones to Mr. Parken, the editor of 'The Eclectic.' The subject is Fénelon, whose new life he wished me to review. As he sent me a present of the book (2 vols. 8vo.) I felt myself bound to make some return; and being resolved against it, in his way, all that remained was to show gratitude in a way of my own. My object is, to detect the faults in Fénelon's system of devotion, by showing the oppositeness of its leading features, to *that* nature which God has formed us with; that word which he has provided to be our guide; and that providence by which he 'ordereth all things, both in heaven and in earth.' Mysticism, or quietism, in a word, would have the mere mind itself, without any of its instrumental powers, not exercised upon (for how could that be, without memory, reflection, conception, &c.) but absorbed in God; and to make this absorption simple, as well as effectual, the instrumental powers are not merely *left* out, but they are *shut* out. They may still serve purposes in this life, but they have no place in perfect religion. This consists in one simple act, or habit, which becomes the more genuine and pure, the less we think about it. In fact, to think about it is to adulterate it; for we cannot think about it without employing, more or less, the instrumental powers of our mind, which are discarded by the leading principles of the system.

"Christianity, on the contrary, takes mankind as it is, and, in its purview, leaves out nothing; affording an antidote for every moral poison, a medicine for every moral disease; and providing, at the same time, unfailing aid, attraction, and occupation, for every faculty and every taste of the soul. 'The occasion,' says William Law, 'of persons of great piety and devotion having fallen into great delusion was, that they made a saint of the natural man. My meaning,' adds he, 'is, they considered their whole nature as the subject of religion and divine graces.' But how signally does St. Paul do this very thing, in that luminous prayer for the Thessalonians, v. 23. This single verse overthrows mysticism; I mean in that transcendental notion of it which Fénelon, and Law, and all the German mystics, have inculcated."

We shall next give an extract from a letter which furnishes us with some of Mr. K.'s opinions as to the Roman Catholics. It was written on occasion of a Roman Catholic gentleman having become intimate with him, and introduced by him into the society in which he lived :

" You will observe, with all this, I do not set down this interesting young man as possessed of efficient piety. He does not consider himself in this view, and I almost fear there are some national hindrances to it, contracted through prejudice against Jansenism. His ideas approach a little towards our anti-fanaticism. But the habits of the Roman Catholic mind, and the resources of the Roman Catholic religion make it easier to meet and combat such notions, than it would be amongst us. The respect for the fathers, in particular, gives the person who defends vital piety an unspeakable advantage. If the Roman Catholic religion had answered no other purpose than to keep up this respect, there would be indemnification for all its crudities. But I doubt much, if there is not a distinct mental acquirement aimed at, and provided for, in every one of those seeming deformities. This I have seen for myself in some instances, and you have taught me to discover it in others; and until there is a disposition and a capacity, on our part, to receive these blessings mentally, they must remain in their corporeal enshrinement, ill-favoured as it may be. How we shall be amazed when fully admitted into the laboratory of Eternal Providence! What use shall we see in things deemed useless! What benefit in things deemed most pernicious! I suspect not a little pains has been used to prevent differences being prematurely made up. I imagine this has been peculiarly the case in the instance of ourselves and the Roman Catholic church. Deep measures have been taken for making our reunion practicable in the fulness of time, but little less deep measures have, also, been taken for keeping it off until that time should be 'fully come.' Such a measure I take to be, the decree of the Council of Lateran, in the year (I think) 1215, under Innocent III. Until then, the actual tenet of transubstantiation had not been enjoined, and the believer in the real presence, was equally Catholic, whether he did or did not suppose a change in the substance of the elements. Accordingly, our church is undeniably Catholic, according to the catholicity which preceded that period: but what was then, for the first time pronounced, we resist, and must resist. I am ready to think this will prove our last remaining barrier to coalescence. Had Archbishop Wake known as much as I happen by this time to know of the differences between us and the church of Rome, he would not have written a second letter on the subject: he would have seen at once, that the project was as unfeasible, '*rebus sic stantibus*,' as a camel going through the eye of a needle. Our Saviour's resource in the case he had in view, can alone make hope rational in the other. And in order, as it were, to strengthen such hope, the language is remarkably varied in the different Evangelists. In one it says, all things are possible, but in another more strongly, as well as more definitively, 'nothing shall be impossible.' In which words there is a fine intimation, that many things at first view, and in earlier stages of the process, deemed utterly impracticable, shall, not-

withstanding, in due season, have their perfect accomplishment. The difficulty in such a case as that just referred to, will arise from the distinction maintained by the church of Rome, between matters of discipline and matters of faith. Even general councils are held fallible, respecting the former; so that no embarrassment can arise in altering mere matters of practice, should motives occur for such alteration. But a point of belief, once established, is less manageable; for, in this instance, infallibility is contended for. Now, the decision of the Council of Lateran is held to concern a point of faith; so that ever since that determination, it is *ex fide*, that the substance of bread and wine is, by the power of Christ, changed into the substance of his body and blood, the species or *appearances* of bread and wine still remaining."

It is but fair to Mr. Jebb, to give his reply to this letter :

"All that you say on the Roman Catholic business, and especially on their doctrine of transubstantiation, appears to me of great importance. The more I think on these matters, the more I am disposed to believe that there are insuperable difficulties in the way of accommodation with the church of Rome. The Gordian knot, I conceive, cannot be untwisted; it must be cut. And who can tell whether the monstrous doctrine of transubstantiation may not have been permitted to become an article of faith for the very purpose, amongst other objects, of obliging the church of Rome, when common sense reasserts her rights, to give up the tenet of infallibility? This point once conceded, it would not be an accommodation between the church of Rome and us, but an universal reformation of the church itself, which would naturally and necessarily follow. And though I willingly admit, that the doctrine of infallibility, in the dark ages, was happily instrumental in preserving the catholic verities, I do believe, that in more advanced times, some far better safeguard may be substituted; the rule of Vincentius Lirinensis, for instance, properly explained and limited. Were I at home, I would offer some observations on the precise words of the Lateran Council, and on what I take to be some very curious passages, given by the centuriators, from Alexander of Hales, and Thomas Aquinas; but at these we can both look, when we meet, which, I trust, will be next week."

These extracts show that though our authors had a toleration for much that is decidedly Roman Catholic, they are not chargeable with absolute Popery: they had their own line perfectly distinct, though certainly not so far removed as we could have wished.

A letter, written about a year after those from which we have made our last extracts, furnishes us with such a perfect picture of Mr. Knox's religious system, that we must give it to our readers. It begins by giving an account of a young man in the higher walks of life coming to Mr. Knox with his mind full of anxiety on the subject of religion; violently distracted between the opposing calls of God and the world, and deeply desirous for

instruction and guidance from Mr. Knox. His description of him is quite characteristic; and in his detail of his manner of dealing with him he discovers, with much precision, the real character of his system :

"Never did I meet an individual more capable of exalted happiness, yet concerning whom I was more dubious whether the desirable point would actually be attained. The seductive world, on one side, eliciting ambition, on pretence of public duty; the 'soi-disant' evangelical fraternity on the other side, at once alluring by its plausibilities, astounding by its dogmatisms, and yet, I think I may say conciliating by its compromises. These are the Scylla and Charybdis between which he is placed; and whether he shall eventually escape both, time alone can tell. I am sure one motive of his coming now to Ireland was, to have conversations with me on both these topics. He knew no one else that could assist him in calculating the hazards, or the possible securities, of a voyage on the open sea of political life, but myself; and what little light I could afford he wished to be possessed of. His mind was already inclined, both on prudential and moral grounds, to decline, for the next five or six years, whatever overtures might be made to him; and I felt it my duty to do all that in me lay, to strengthen that disposition. If he finally resolves upon it, and a few months now must settle it, I shall have strong hope that danger from the world is, at least in a good degree, surmounted. In that case, his better tastes will have space to evolve; and in proportion as these advance, his hazards from Calvinism will lessen. Such, at least, is my hope, excited by the manner in which he moved with me in the discussion of certain theological questions. Our last conversation was on the sense in which our Saviour is the *Ἰλασμος* *πρὸς τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς ἄνθρωποι*: and I never talked to one who weighed what was said, and remarked on it with more candour, clearness, or strength. I had it in my power to enounce central truths—those which constitute the strength of the cause; and he so received them as to warrant expectation that he will often think them over, and perhaps never wholly part with them. Towards the close of the conversation, he seemed almost to say, *γλυκύ η̃ ἀληθὲς*. My object was to distinguish between the *salvability*, once and for all procured, and the *salvation*, individually and morally accomplished. I wished to prove, and I think I satisfied him, that no act of reliance upon the *salvability*, could confer the *salvation*; the former being but a mere possibility, therefore, not even interesting until the salvation itself was valued and sought: and that this latter being substantially that *new moral nature*, which brings us back to God, and fits us indispensably for eternally enjoying him, it must be sought for practically and morally; not regarded merely or chiefly as the object of *thought*, however warm, or of *reliance*, however confident; but as a matter of inward consciousness and experimental attainment. He asked how the death of Christ had direct effect on this moral process, and when I endeavoured to show, that such an object alone could disenchant the human mind, naturally enslaved to sensuality, vanity, and ambition; could make the proud humble, or the passionate meek, or the irritable calm, or the obdurate tender, he understood

me, and seemed to see that Deity, thus modified into a *moral medicine*, was fitted to work, not merely convincingly or persuasively, but energetically. I was able also to point out a difference to him between *satisfaction for sin*, and *impetrative merit*. The latter I wished to attribute unreservedly to our Redeemer, inasmuch as it acts upon the divine love; whereas *satisfaction* (which, however, in a sound sense, I did not dispute) was liable to be so understood as to obscure and sadden our views of the divine nature. I illustrated my idea of our Saviour's merit availing for us, by the instance of an artist's block of marble. When this is taken from the quarry it is only so much stone; but every portion of labour which the statuary expends upon it raises its value. He has communicated something of his own to it by every skilful touch; and he who feels the excellence of the worker, is proportionately interested by that transfused excellence which the advancing subject exhibits. This idea, when applied to the work of moral melioration, loses nothing of its force; on the contrary, it acquires new force, as well as brightness and tenderness. To my apprehension it places redeemed man (and much more, renovated individuals made righteous, in a degree perhaps made holy) in a relation to the redeeming and renovating Word, and through Him, to the Eternal Father, which is as gratifying and delightful as any thought could be within the utmost range of possible cogitation. I could not hesitate to urge this view as more than an adequate substitute for all the plausibilities of Calvinism; while enlightened good sense would see it was liable to none of those abuses of which Calvinistic theology is not only accused by its opponents, but, (if we can judge by the guards and cautions resorted to,) suspected by its dearest friends."

We have here Mr. Knox's own account of his religious system, practically applied to an interesting individual who looked up to him for guidance in the ways of truth. We have, fairly and plainly stated by himself, his dislike of, and dissent from evangelical religion, under the name of Calvinism, and we have equally plainly laid down, the system which he would substitute in its place.

This conversation was indeed upon a most important subject, "the propitiation for our sins." Mr. K. was surely mistaken if he thought he was arguing against Calvinism, or Calvinists, when pleading for the universality of the redemption of Christ. Who, for example, was more avowedly a Calvinist than Archbishop Ussher, yet who a more strenuous defender of universal redemption? Was not Thomas Scott a Calvinist? Yet he held with our church, that "Christ redeemed me and all mankind." But where Mr. K. differed from Calvinists, he differed from multitudes who were not Calvinists. It was not upon a point peculiar to Calvinists. The peculiarity of his system is set before us in these words of his, "I wished to prove, and I think I satisfied him, that no act of reliance upon the *salvability* could confer *salvation*; the former being but a mere possibility." He denies that trust in the work of Christ for us confers salvation. On the other hand, he asserts that the new moral nature, or the

work in us, is salvation. Now, in the Scripture, salvation is evidently taken in two senses. First, to imply the state of peace and acceptance into which a sinner is brought by acceptance of and reliance on the work of Christ; this is a present salvation spoken of in such texts as Luke xix. 9. "*This day is salvation come to this house.*" 2 Tim. i. 9. "*Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling,*" &c.

Secondly. To imply the state of outward and inward glory and holiness to which the redeemed shall finally be brought, through the spirit and power of the Lord. This is a progressive future salvation, spoken of in such texts as Rom. xiii. 11. "*Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.*" 1 Pet. i. v. "*Who are kept by the power of God, through faith, unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last days.*" It appears to us, that that man is in error who denies that both these senses belong to the term salvation—who puts aside either of these senses. That man indeed would be in error who should assert that there was no salvation, but that conferred by reliance upon the work of Christ; that there is no work of grace which is an essential part of salvation; no work of glory, which is the perfection of salvation: but awfully fundamentally does he err, who denies that to be salvation which is conferred when the sinner is led to rely upon the atoning blood and sacrifice of that Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world. Such salvation as the apostle spoke of when he said, "We have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." It is melancholy to think how Mr. Knox was able to argue a young, anxious enquirer out of the comfortable truth of present salvation through faith in the atonement of Christ. We would ask, could any thing possibly be more inadequate, more low, more short of the truth, than the answer to the young man's most intelligent and suitable question, "how the death of Christ had direct effect upon this moral process?" "That such an object alone, could disenchant the human mind, naturally enslaved to sensuality, vanity, and ambition; could make the proud humble, or the passionate meek, or the irritable calm, or the obdurate tender." Surely he could have found a better answer, but one not so suitable to his system, from Paul, 2 Cor. v. 14. "*For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all then were all dead: and that he died for all, that they which live should not, henceforth, live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.*"

In illustrating the idea of our Saviour's merit availing for us, by the instance of an artist's block of marble, he has entirely done away with the whole notion of merit availing for us, and turned it (as his system requires) into a power operating on us. He has confounded two perfectly distinct ideas, "the Saviour's merit availing for us," and "his communicating something of his own to us." An error exactly analagous to that of the decrees of the Council of Trent on the article of justification.

The editor is more delicate with regard to this young man than he generally is, and has not given the initials of his name; we are, however, pretty confident that we do not mistake the person alluded to, who put himself into Mr. Knox's school; and we very much fear that Mr. K. not only succeeded in turning him from the dangers of Calvinism, but that he gave up, with what was called Calvinism, vital godliness; and it would be a great gratification to us could we hear that he had not disappointed these expectations of piety and devotedness of which his early life gave promise. But it certainly is, more than ever, our serious opinion that there is not vitality in the system of Messrs. Knox and Jebb; and whilst we would hope that they themselves might be saved, as through fire, we fear very much that their disciples will be found to be but as "wood, hay, stubble."

Whilst we are upon this subject of what we cannot help considering fundamental error, we think it may be as well not to confine ourselves to the order in which the letters occur in this correspondence, but in this place give an extract from a later letter of Mr. Knox, which gives deliberately his sentiments on the subject of justification. It is dated Feb. 25, 1818:

"I have done what I could to trace the meaning of the word *δικαιοσύνη*, through the various passages where it is used; and I rest confident that, in every instance, it expresses the inward principle, and vital habit of moral rectitude, in its trinal aspect, to God, our neighbours, and ourselves. In its implantation and essence it is *δικαιοσύνη*: in its maturity and perfection it is *ἀγιωσύνη*. I do not, therefore, recognize two causes, and two effects. What was done, in the first instance, *for* man, could, in the nature of things, operate only preparatively to what was afterwards to be done *in* him. By this internal process, alone, could a morally diseased intelligence be made whole. Here, therefore, alone, do I see what can properly be called *cause*; inasmuch as here, alone, do I discover what can be truly termed *effect*. The cause is, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ; the effect is, inward and spiritual renovation, initial, and complete: justification, which implies a vital insertion of the root of righteousness; and sanctification, which implies an actual production of the fruit of the Spirit, in all its blessed variety.

"If I am asked, do I understand justification, exclusively, in the sense of making morally, or spiritually righteous? I answer, no. I wish to understand this term exactly as St. Paul uses it; and he certainly applies it to the reckoning which God makes of us, as well as to the work which he effects in us. 'I know nothing by myself,' he says, 'yet am I not hereby justified, for he that judgeth me is the Lord.' But I am deeply confident that the word never is used in the reputative meaning of it, as recognizing, by divine approbation, that which has been produced by divine power. How connected these two acts of the Supreme Being are, may be seen in those words of the 1st chapter of Genesis, 'And God said, Let there be light—and there was light: and God saw that it was good.'"

Now here is, we conceive, fundamental error openly professed, and against which we must raise loud our voice, even did

the avowal come from the dearest and nearest friend we have in the world. Luther well said that justification was the "*articulum stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*;" and in the sense in which Luther held it, and in which our church holds it, Mr. Knox denies it. Our church takes it in what Mr. Knox calls the "reputative meaning;" "We are *accounted* righteous before God." Mr. Knox takes it as implying "a vital insertion of a root of righteousness." He thereby confounds justification and sanctification, and gets rid entirely of the very notion of the free acceptance of the sinner, on account of the life and death of his substitute; for whose merit, the believer in him is accounted righteous before God. There is a very extraordinary postscript to this letter, from which it would appear that Mr. Knox had a misgiving about his own system, and held though it were as by a thread to the view of things which his words denied:

"P.S. I ought, perhaps, to mention, that I admit doctrinal faith, as insisted on by modern theologians, to be, in one other instance beside that stated within, the legitimate parent of feeling. I mean, where through error or ignorance, there is a despair of the Divine mercy. For this malady, the truths included in the forensic system, are perhaps the specific."

We think we may well call this an extraordinary postscript. After having spent his strength in a long letter, to prove that there is no such thing as justification in the forensic sense; that in fact, justification means a totally different thing, i. e. the vital insertion of a root of righteousness, then Mr. K. recommends this very view of justification as a specific where, "through error or ignorance, there is a despair of divine mercy." Can a non-entity be "a specific?" Can a false view of an important doctrine be the appropriate remedy for a serious and not uncommon disorder? No: it gives us pleasure, because it gives us hope as to Mr. Knox's own state, that he thus recognizes the "truths of the forensic system." And it has gratified us to observe, that in many places there are indications that this amiable and interesting man fell back, at times, on those doctrines which at other times he used all his ingenuity and energy to oppose.

But we must retrace our steps, and go back to the part of the correspondence from which we diverged.

In March, 1813, we find Mr. Jebb thus expressing himself as to the authority of the church; a subject, which about this time much occupied his mind:

"It has just occurred to me, that when Christendom becomes what it ought, the authority of the church will be a powerful instrument in diffusing Christianity as a science. You complained of Protestantism being unsystematic. How can it be otherwise? Some grand principles of interpretation must be so authoritatively laid down, that they cannot lawfully be contravened, before any thing like system can obtain. This would be the very antipode of Chillingworthian private judgment. But private judg-

ment, surely, is inconsistent with the very notion of a science. How would the astronomer, the mathematician, the chymist, laugh at the asserter of private judgment? Would not a person be accounted mad, that were to say, The moon is made of green cheese; I maintain it; I have a right to do so; it is my private judgment. Two and two make five; it is my private judgment. Gold and brass have the same weight, properties, and value; it is my private judgment. Yet this ridiculous farce is every day enacted in theology; and this is Protestantism. Is divinity then unphilosophical? Has it no principles? Is it no science? I trow otherwise. How would any human science, I will not say advance, but how could it be taught, if principles were thus thrown aside? And what hopes may we not hold of the advancement of theology, when principles shall be held as tenaciously as by the church of Rome, without her accompaniment of error? This, surely, is a comfortable prospect."

We have differed from our authors upon many, nay, upon most of the points which have been brought before us; but we never had before to say, that the way in which either of them spoke of those who differed from them was disingenuous; but we really think this a most disingenuous way of treating those who contend for private judgment. We really thought the astronomers, mathematicians, chymists, &c., did exercise private judgment. We did not know that talking nonsense was essential to the exercise and maintenance of private judgment. We had in our simplicity, thought that the exercise of private judgment had contributed to the establishment of sound philosophy. We had thought, through the exercise of private judgment, we were indebted, for instance, for the establishment of the truth in astronomy, that the earth moves round the sun, instead of our being now bound to maintain the exploded error that the sun revolves round the earth. It would have been consistent in the asserters of Popish infallibility, in those who condemned Gallileo as an heretic, to have written such a sentence as, "Private judgment is inconsistent with the very notion of a science." We have no hesitation in saying, that if the editor had one particle of judgment, or had, indeed, exercised the least portion of common sense, he never would have published such a weak, silly letter; one that we are perfectly convinced Mr. Jebb himself would have thrown into the fire. Surely the most violent asserters of private judgment never could have dreamed of asking for more freedom in its exercise in theology than is exhibited in philosophy. Chillingworth, whom Mr. Jebb holds up as the very ultra apostle of private judgment, never asked more for himself or for others than is asserted and exercised by every astronomer, mathematician, and chymist, whom Mr. Jebb so ridiculously introduces as laughing at the asserter of private judgment.

About the time when this last letter was written, Mr. Knox had written an account of a friend of his, K——, having openly

broached to his congregation the uncatholic doctrine of the intermediate sleep; and in his remarks upon it says :

"Painful as such an instance is, it conveys deep instruction. It shows that, in that simplicity of Bible religion, which so many exclusively contend for, and so many more unconsciously strive to diffuse, there is no security for any man, however honest, however intentionally pious, being completely, himself, what he substantially now is, at any future period; suppose at twenty, fifteen, ten, or even seven years' end."

To this Mr. Jebb replies, March, 1813 :

"What you say about —, is truly both melancholy and instructive. The good man himself will, I trust, be saved, though as through fire; but what wood, hay, and stubble, may he not accumulate and vend? It is my wish and prayer, that I may be saved from *the simplicity of Bible religion*. Indeed I believe that, in my very constitution, I have some safeguard. I love system, antiquity, and authority. I read, during my illness, much of Alison. I am taking more to imagination."

Now, we must protest against the total want of judgment, the ignorance of right Christianity, exhibited by the editor. He has omitted the beginning of this letter: perhaps it contained something excellent; and he has given this unguarded expression of Mr. Jebb to the public, marking the most objectionable parts of it with italics, lest it should escape the reader's eye.

From our acquaintance with the school to which its author belonged, we can translate the passage, and put a gloss upon it, so as to get rid of some of its offensive meaning; but with the generality of readers it will lower Mr. Jebb in their estimation.

The next extract we shall give is to show how fully Mr. Jebb coincided with his friend in the rejection of forensic justification, and all the "speculative comfort," as they termed it, which might flow from it.

Mr. Knox had, in a letter, expressed his fears lest Mr. Jebb was wavering a little, and coming over to that, as he would call it, Calvinistic view of the subject. Mr. Jebb thus sets his mind at ease :

"As to speculative grounds of comfort, I do (as I have done for the last six or seven years) most entirely renounce, and most cordially dislike them. Not a movement of my mind turns that way; and as to the feelings of my heart, I have yet to learn how they could be touched by a speculative non-entity. Worthy people, and even good people may, and do, in this point, deceive themselves. But I am deeply of opinion that their delusion is fed, either by moral deficiency, consciously allowed, or unconsciously cherished, or by a pitiable weakness and morbidness of mind; and, whatever be the cause, I am certain that in all cases the result is unfriendly to the growth of Christian goodness, and consequently of solid, inward, spiritual consolation. Speculative comfort is, in truth, a sort of mental dram-drinking. It may afford a momentary stimulus, a temporary relief, but it is permanently inju-

rious to the moral constitution. Your path to comfort, I hope and trust, will be mine; I firmly believe it is the only true one. In a very imperfect degree, I have found it so. God grant I may so find it more and more!"

We have, perhaps, furnished our readers with sufficient materials to form their estimate of the religious system of our authors. We must, therefore, in future, be more sparing in our extracts on that subject. About this time Mr. Jebb begins to appear in a new character; he tells us of his beginning to prepare a volume of sermons for the press; and it may be amusing and interesting to be let behind the scenes, and allowed to read the estimate which the author formed of himself and his work, and then to read Mr. Knox's "critique" after the volume had passed through the press:

"I have lately commenced an undertaking in which I trust I may be enabled to persevere—the revising and recomposing some of my sermons, with some view to publication. Some of my older ones, though deficient in terseness, pointedness, and polish, seem to me to have considerable *stamina*. That, for instance, of '*They that sleep*,' &c. I now like much better than I ever liked it before. I propose, both with a view to unity of subject, and to moderation of longitude, that it should, in a reformed edition, fall into two discourses. One of these I have composed, and it seems to me among the very best I ever produced: through the other, I pretty well see my way; much of the materials are ready in the old one; more materials seem tolerably arranged in my mind; and as to the amputation of needless words, and the supply of strong ones, I trust that my small powers both of judgment and invention are greater than heretofore. One secret I must disclose, namely, that in several of my latest and least objectionable discourses, I meet with a *mannerism*, to me at present absolutely offensive; a species of phraseology peculiar and abhorrent from the usage, not only of polite secular writers, but of our own chaste translation of the Bible, of our best theological writers, and (making allowance for the different genius of different languages,) of the ecclesiastical succession of the catholic church. Such phraseology has in it something which at once offends good taste, and puzzles plain understandings. It often rather veils than discloses an object; and even where it pleases and engages, and appears to instruct, I more than suspect that it throws a false colouring over subjects, by involving them in a sort of gaudy mist."

* * * * *

"The above relates especially to manner. Respecting matter, I would say, that, let the "Christian Observer" people speak as they please, (see their review, in the Number for July, of '*Dean Ryder's Sermons*,') I feel more and more a disposition to cling to the department, as I conceive, most congenial with the providential function of our church; the department of EDIFICATION, rather than of EXCITEMENT. I cannot, I own, 'wish to see' in others, much less can I propose it as an object to myself, 'that the largest portion of every sermon should be appropriated to the largest portion,

confessedly the ignorant and careless, of the audience.' Has the Holy Scripture been thus *appropriated* by the Holy Spirit? Does it not, on the contrary, *there only* meet its most appropriate usufructuaries, and *then only* discharge its most enlarged and most appropriate function, when it is intelligently and affectionately approached, and deeply and profoundly investigated, and practically and spiritually imbibed, by the best prepared and best instructed minds, by the most awakened and most interested hearts? The best writings of the best and ablest Christians, in all ages, must be tried by the same test; and assuredly, they will nobly stand the trial; and they who are best qualified to pronounce, will not merely confess as a truth, but lay down as a principle, that Christian writers and preachers have been, and will be, able and useful exactly in proportion as they advance those grand and deep truths, which the ignorant cannot apprehend, and which the careless will inevitably disregard. 'God,' indeed, as *they say* after Scripture, 'is no respecter of persons.' But in what consists his equitable distribution? Is it in attenuating his gifts, till they suit the tenuity of the receiver? He causes his sun to shine, and his rain to fall, indeed, equally upon all. But it is the sun in his undiminished splendour; it is the rain in unpolled purity. It is no dim and dull obscurity of light; it is no perturbed and stagnant muddiness of moisture. It must indeed be owned, that in the religious world of today, a substantial evil does exist, against which the C. O. was, with good intention, solicitous to guard. But I humbly conceive, that the physician is not merely unacquainted with the causes and the cure of the disease, but that he is also himself infected. 'The bent of some, and those eminent and distinguished preachers seems to be, rather that of addressing the elect people of God, as the class for whom more especially, if not exclusively, the word of this salvation was sent, and who alone have, or can have, an ear to listen to its instructions.' This is doubtless very true; and it is also very much to be deprecated. But in what instance does it obtain? In the instance, we must believe, of high-flying, doctrinal dogmatists, whose preaching is notional, rather than moral, who dwell on peculiar views of divine truth, on special determinations of God's sovereign will, on exclusive privileges of God's chosen people. It is not so much the moral elevation, as the revolting dogmatism of this mode of preaching, which makes it unacceptable, unintelligible, and unfruitful, amongst ordinary congregations. Indeed, moral elevation is out of the question. But how far would the C. O. remedy the evil? Partaking itself of the disorder, it is unconscious of its malady; and, like all who have been unpractised in the examination of themselves, it is little qualified to prescribe for others. It would willingly retain the dogmatism; it would cling to the unhealthful sustenance, which feeds and fosters the disease; but it would superadd a certain mawkish diluent, which, for all moral purposes, will be found miserably inefficient. A low and dull morality, attenuated to the low and dull conceptions of the vulgar, or even a warm and exciting tone of expostulation, addressed to the indolent and careless, when, of set purpose and full premeditation, divested of strength and body, of fulness and of grandeur, is little calculated to advance a congregation; and perhaps, too,

very imperfectly calculated to awaken and reform. But the truth is, that of advancement, they have little notion. They regard Christianity almost exclusively, as a *remedial* process; little aware that Christianity is then alone rightly apprehended, when viewed as most sublimely perfective. Here, I conceive, lies their grand error."

"I grant, indeed, that there is such a thing as an awakening, exciting department. But this department is not in our church. And assuredly it is not to be produced within our church by the superinduction of a dull, vapid, spiritless morality, upon a dry, stern, disputatious dogmatism. Such people will be always learning, and never coming to the knowledge of the truth. Such people must inevitably remain nondescript and amphibious entities, without the stability and elevation of a hierarchy, without the magnetism and energy of a sect."

We shall say nothing of Mr. Jebb's opinions of his own sermons, but we must make a remark or two as to what, in his opinion, should be the *matter* of all Church of England sermons. In the first place, we must call in question the correctness of the idea suggested, that a Church of England sermon should be any thing that is not fully suited to the circumstances of those to whom the sermon is addressed.

If, as we conceive the fact to be, the far larger portion of those collected under the ministry of a clergyman of the Church of England are not in a situation to profit by that which aims at edification, or building up, but need that which is calculated to excite them, and to awaken them, we maintain that the preaching of a Church of England clergyman should not aim at edification, to the exclusion of excitement and awakening. We must protest loudly against the sentiment put forward in the following sentence: "I grant that there is such a thing as an awakening, exciting department; but this department is not in our church." We would ask, why not in our church? Upon what authority does Mr. Jebb say, that the department of awakening is not in our church? We consider Mr. Jebb entirely mistaken, and we consider him most dangerously and hurtfully mistaken: but we do, on the part of our church, deny the charge. It belongs to the preaching of our church to aim, under the Divine blessing, at doing all that sinners in every circumstance, want.

The preaching of our church should aim at awakening the sleeping and the dead; and also, at edifying those who have been awakened and made alive; and though it is not our part now to review or criticize Mr. Jebb's sermons, we feel bound to say, that when we first read them, and ever since our first acquaintance with them, we always considered it to be their fault that they were not calculated to awaken the sleeping, or quicken the dead; and that whilst they might be used by those spiritually alive, for their edification, they would deceive the unconverted,

and set them upon the fruitless attempt of external improvement, while they were not, as yet, possessed of the first principles of divine life. We think the fault of such preaching as Mr. Jebb deliberately chooses for himself is, not only that it neglects to provide for the larger portion of the congregation, but that it deceives them, and by putting them upon a wrong pursuit, puts them further and further away from that which can alone save their souls.

The "Christian Observer," with all those that in common hold evangelical views, will not be much flattered by his remarks on their system; but when aware of Mr. Jebb's views they will not be much surprised. It will, we are sure, be interesting to our readers to have Mr. Knox's opinions on the book of sermons when it came out:

"Your most interesting letter would furnish me with many a theme, but I will, in this first instance, admit none but your sermons.

"I own to you, then, freely, that I shall be most curious to know, what reviewers will say of them. I almost doubt whether they will not be as much puzzled as they have been for a long time. They will not question either the talent or the literature of the writer. The volume contains such ample evidence of both, such manifestations both of eloquence and erudition, as to make these admissions certain. And where there is a spark of goodness, the spirit which animates the discourses throughout will be felt and recognized. I do not, therefore, apprehend any lack of special approbation. And I think, too, the positive faults alleged will not be very substantial. It will probably be said that the discourses have a good deal of that warm effusion which is a characteristic of the Irish pulpit; and possibly, after all your care they will complain of, here and there, what you call mannerism. It may be, they will still more deeply complain that your meaning is not always sufficiently obvious; and that, notwithstanding a prevalent vein of sound sense, it might not sometimes be doubted whether you were not verging toward the cloudy region of fanaticism.

"If, however, your volume should meet some more discerning mind, it will be perceived and acknowledged that, under a declamatory appearance, you are laying down principles; that what might appear, at first view, to have been said to impress, is often, from its depth and digestiveness, fitted to convince; and that, in reality, you philosophize when you seem most to neglect the forms of philosophy. But I fear this will not be remarked in the 'Christian Observer;' and it has little chance of being observed by the 'British Critic,' though there is some one who writes for it that might make these discoveries. I should, however, most reckon upon something of this sort from the 'Eclectic Review,' notwithstanding all the quarrels it will have for wants in divinity, and high claims for the hierarchical church. The 'Quarterly Review' will be likeliest to speak approvingly; but it will hardly exercise due discernment.

"Let these matters turn out as they may, I am not sorry you have made this commencement. I certainly feel myself less adequate to judge of your writing than I should be of almost any one's else. Why do I say almost?

There is none who will ever write, capable of so unfitting me for the art of coolly estimating. It is next to reading my own writing. I, therefore, am suspicious and jealous about results: yet, in spite of suspicion and jealousy, I believe you are safe. And I think you will be encouraged to write more, and I also think, nay, am sure, that you will write better and better. I think so for two reasons; 1st, the superiority of the completely new parts, which to me who can make the distinction, is striking; and 2dly, the still superior mode of expressing yourself, which is found in your commonest and least studied letters: an ease, this, which will assuredly flow into your compositions, from the pulpit or the press, the more confidence you gain in yourself, and the less anxious you are about the judgment of the world: I mean, from an honest assurance, that you have nothing about which to be fearful.

"I this morning read your sermon on Abraham; and all it wanted to interest and please me in a high degree, was, the not sufficiently showing, in the close, the sense in which all are called to tread in the steps of Abraham. You, I think, almost confine your application to those who are called to make some special sacrifice. 'Are we then,' &c. you say, p. 120. This is all most true, and yet I think I should have liked another topic better. I mean that view of strictly moral relinquishment which, being every man's duty, would apply to every individual. Still it is an absolutely engaging discourse. All that is said of Abraham being most interesting, and practically impressive."

It may not, perhaps, be uninteresting to give a criticism on these sermons, contained in a letter from the late Mrs. H. Thornton to Mr. Jebb himself, and yet, though intended on the whole to approve, as must be the case in letters addressed to the author himself, at the conclusion, very delicately more than hinting the defect which we have mentioned. Mrs. Thornton's letter is copied by Mr. Jebb for the use of Mr. Knox:

"Mrs. Henry Thornton says, 'I have read some of your sermons with great delight. The tendency of them is so constantly to wean the heart from its attachment to earthly vanities, and to induce it to grasp that golden chain which is to draw us up from earth to heaven, that they may be truly called angels' food. But whether these consolations are not too great, too remote, to be frequently regarded with safety, is a question which I have often and ardently wished to hear argued by you, and some judicious pious men of our English school. In my present depressed state, I firmly believe all such contemplations are not only safe but salutary. Torn and wounded as I have been; and still in danger of being wrecked, by anxiety for my numerous children, nothing is more likely to protect me from the incursion of those bad thoughts which would lead me to distrust the mercy and the love of my gracious heavenly Father, than that subdued and purified state of mind, which you so beautifully describe, and promise to those who really pray for it. Perhaps, in the bright hours of my earthly prosperity, I should have turned from these exhortations, as incompatible with my present enjoyments. Perhaps, had I been a determined violator of the holy laws of

God, I might have required a more loud and awful denunciation of the anger of God, and a more full declaration of the Saviour's willingness to purify and pardon me, through his death and intercession; but being, as I am, nothing, I think, can be better calculated to pour balm into my sad spirit, and to lead me on in those paths which shall conduct me at length to the peace of God which passeth all understanding."

We must give our readers a specimen of the views entertained by these two friends on the subject of the Roman church. Our first extract shall be from a letter of Mr. Jebb's, on occasion of the appointment of a new priest to his parish:

"You will be glad to hear that we have got into this parish a treasure of a young priest; zealous and indefatigable among his flock; a constant and impressive preacher; open, engaging, and gentlemanlike in his deportment; unaffectedly cordial in his intercourse and cooperation with Mr. Forster and myself; and withal a very pleasant companion. There is not an atom of indifferentism in his liberality; and, on the whole, I consider both the parish and myself very fortunate in his appointment.

"It is said, and on what I take to be the best authority, that Dr. Everard has been appointed, that is, that the postulation has been transmitted to Rome for his appointment, as coadjutor to Archbishop Bray. In this I should rejoice. It was said that he had come over; and in this supposition I sent over to Thurles, by my friend the parish priest, the enclosed letter. He, however, brought it back, and you have it. Would it be well to write some such letter to Dr. Everard, when he does come over?"

We give Mr. Knox's cautious reply:

"The letter to Dr. Everard well bespeaks your kind and liberal feeling; but whether such an overture should be made to him by you, supposing him actually in that situation, (of which I have heard nothing but vague newspaper report,) is another question. I own I am as well pleased it is in my possession as in his. Liberal as I hope I am, toward the Roman Catholic religion, I would not be too prompt in committing myself to its clergy. I would meet them cordially, and cherish their kindly movements; but I would not put it in the power of any knowing Roman Catholic ecclesiastic to make a cold return to my kindness, nor an unfair use of my ingenuousness. Dr. Everard's intercourse with us was, in every instance, on his side, spontaneous. He came, on the slightest invitation (a kind one on my part, certainly, but not a pressing one,) both to C—— and to B——. Afterwards, I saw little of him, and that little, I say to you in confidence, forced me to deem him more showy than solid; though, I would fain hope, not dishonest or hypocritical. My feeling towards him at this moment is just such as that I would receive him, if he offered himself, with the same cordiality of manner as ever (if his manner should leave room for it): but I would give him no more of me than he clearly chose to have. And should he come into your neighbourhood, I would advise you to take the same line. I would send him a civil, nay, a kind message, by your young priest; but I would not write to him.

"In short, there is no class of men whom I would more critically try, before I would trust, than thorough-trained Roman Catholic ecclesiastics. I deem them to be a most necessary agency in the great system; but their peculiar circumstances too often merge the man in the functionary."

* *

"I rejoice with you respecting your young priest. It gives a gratifying specimen of what I have long been fancying attainable. If others, in your situation, felt as you feel, increasing instances of like kind would, perhaps, be found, and certainly would at length be formed; till at length charity and good sense, would triumph over weakness and prejudice. I would be glad to know where your priest received his education; and, if at Maynooth, what his name is, and when he came out."

We shall pass on a little to give an entertaining letter, which unfolds more of Mr. Jebb's sentiments on the same subject, and which also gives us some of his criticisms upon the characters in the religious world with whom he came in contact. It is dated June, 1815 :

"You so encourage me to continue my letters, that I am truly sorry I disappointed your kind calculations; this, however, will reach you within a week of the time at which you expected to hear; and, had I not been peculiarly occupied and on the move, you should have heard long ago. Yesterday (Tuesday) I returned from Cambridge, which I reached, the day before, from Lady O. S——'s. You are, doubtless, aware that the general effect of Cambridge, is incomparably below that of Oxford; that King's College Chapel is, perhaps, the first thing of the kind in Europe, with various other et ceteras, which it is needless here to mention. But I can tell you one or two things. Mr. —, a fellow, and late tutor of Magdalen, brought me over in his gig to the University; and having shown me the lions, and given me my dinner, brought me to Mr. —, in the evening. As the friend of Mr. H—— and Lady O. S——, he received me most cordially: and at once, 'sicut est mos' of him and his party, began to catechize me, 'What part of Ireland?' 'Whether curate or rector?' 'How long in my present situation?' &c. &c. Hearing that I had formerly resided in Cashel, he said, 'The Archbishop of C. is favourable, is he not?' It was clear he took me for an aspirant at least, if not for an adept, and therefore used the cabalistic jargon of the sect. I was literally unable exactly to decipher his meaning, and unwilling to ask it; therefore I looked, probably with the stupid stare of deafness, or misapprehension. Mr. —, again identically repeated the question. By this time I was collected enough to take his meaning, and determined to evade a reply, and to show that I had not the watchword: therefore I answered, 'The Archbishop of C. is an excellent man.' Soon after he said, 'You are in a country very much swarming with Papists.' 'Yes,' replied I, 'there are a great number of Roman Catholics in my parish: it is extensive, and I have but fifteen or sixteen Protestant families:' this, I believe, was further drawn out by a question relative to the comparative numbers. 'Then,' said Mr. —,

'have you made any exertions among the Papists, to bring them over?' 'No,' I replied: 'the attempt would be altogether in vain; and, indeed, I do not feel myself called on to use exertions of that nature.' 'But, have you consulted with other ministers, as to the line of conduct which you should adopt?' 'I have thought much upon the subject; and my mind is fully made up, that I ought not to interfere; particularly as I know the people to be under the care of a very pious and attentive parish priest.' 'But do you not feel it your duty to attempt the conversion of those poor people from the damnable errors of Popery?' 'I cannot think that they labour under damnable errors; they have erred, and do err, grossly and absurdly, but not, I conceive, damnably; else how could their church produce so many pious and excellent individuals?' 'That is owing to the goodness of God, who has permitted some individuals to be better than their system.' 'But surely their doctrine of justification, and their abominable doctrine of human merit are damnable.' 'I cannot think so: some crude things they do say, on the point of merit; but they firmly believe that we can do no good thing but by the grace of Christ.' 'Yes; but they give their works a share in their justification, and they should be opposed,' &c. To all this, I said, in order to cut short useless discussion, 'that from birth, education, and providential circumstances, and of deliberate choice, I dissented from the errors of Popery; that Divine Providence had made me the superintendent of a church-of-England flock; to that little flock, I endeavoured to pay attention. That the same Providence saw fit to leave the population of my parish under the care of another pastor; that with him, I did not think it, in any degree, my duty to interfere,' &c. &c. And so, after a few words more on both sides, the discussion ended. At parting, Mr. — spoke kindly to me. I begged he might not account me quite a heretic. He replied, cordially enough, that persons, certainly, were best able to judge of the circumstances under which they were placed; and that, without a knowledge of circumstances, he should be sorry to pass the least unfavourable judgment.

"He is an amiable, ardent, and particular sort of character: somewhat, as I take it, vain of his own exertions, and receiving, from those who approach him *'capite obatipo,'* this homage as no more than a just tribute. It is assuredly no little trial to be at the head of a party, with influence widely extending, and a very ample revenue. I fear that evangelicism is no barrier against pride; and that the merit of works is practically held, outside of the church of Rome. Still, Mr. — is a worthy, and sincerely religious man. —, too, prepared me for something peculiar; saying, that he could not be known by a few interviews, but greatly improved upon acquaintance. He had been upon a judaico-financial tour, had preached on the same day, as he said, in the morning to 2000, in the evening to 3000 people, and chuckled at having bled the people of Bristol of their money."

We have here put forward, with a clearness that prevents all mistake, Mr. Jebb's feelings towards Roman Catholics, and towards those whom he would call the Evangelicals. How he could reconcile his views of its not being his duty, in any degree,

to interfere with the Roman Catholic population of his parish, with his engagement at his ordination, "to be ready with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's word," we are utterly at a loss to divine. Many persons may be in wonder and astonishment how such a man as Mr. Jebb could exhibit this greater kindness towards Roman Catholics than towards Evangelical Protestants; but the fact, strange as it is, and afflicting as it is, can be easily accounted for. On the fundamental article of justification, he held sentiments more nearly allied to the first than to the last.

In the progress of the correspondence, we find the subject of Mr. Jebb's "*Sacred Literature*" introduced, for which he began to make preparations after the printing of his sermons, and which he subsequently published in the year 1820. It is this work more than any thing else that bids fair to give Mr. Jebb a lasting character as an author. It is one which we read with pleasure when it first appeared, and into which we have since looked occasionally, and received, we trust, not only gratification, but instruction. This correspondence shows us that whatever merit is due for the original plan of the work belongs to Mr. Knox, whilst the industry and judgment displayed in the execution belongs to Mr. Jebb. It would be out of place, as it would exceed all reasonable limits, were we to enter into any examination of this work. It has been long familiar, we doubt not, to most of our readers; and they have, no doubt, long since formed their estimate of its worth. The subject occupied much of the thought and correspondence of the two friends for some years about this period.

There are many interesting letters, by both, which we are constrained to omit. We rather notice subjects less generally known, and therefore draw our readers' attention to sentiments put forward by Mr. Knox, on the subject of the eucharist:

"I do not know whether I have ever called your attention to the twofold evidence afforded by St. Paul's expressions respecting the eucharist—the consecrated symbols are not merely (as Dr. Waterland maintains) the signs or pledges of a concomitant blessing, but (as the old church taught, and as Dr. Butt urges against Waterland) the actual vehicles, through which that blessing is conveyed. I conceive this latter idea is expressly recognized, by the cup which is blessed, being distinctly represented as the communion of Christ's blood, and the bread which is broken, as the communion of Christ's body. This deliberate, and, as it were, studied designation, of each consecrated element by itself, has an import, which no mind, I conceive, at once intelligent and unprejudiced, can resist. But it seems as if St. Paul meant to fit his discourse, for dispelling the false conceptions of distant times; and, therefore, when he gives warning of the malediction, which awaited the profaners of this holy ordinance, he makes the symbols the vehicles of the curse, as expressively as before of the blessing; in order, as it were, that in the mouth of two witnesses, the truth intended to be taught,

should unanswerably be established. 'He,' says he, 'who eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh *εἰς* himself.' He does not merely incur judgment, but he eats and drinks it. The sacred things which he desecrates are, mysteriously, their own avengers. The divine virtue combined, by Omnipotence, with the blessed and broken elements, for the purpose of transfusing life and health to the soul of the qualified receiver, in the case of profane reception, still no less manifests itself to be divine, but in a contrary way, *secundum modum recipientis*.

"In the light of this twofold instrumentality, marked, we might almost say, with premeditated accuracy of expression, can we question the analogical equivalence of the Christian eucharist to the Israelitish ark? The instances in which this latter pledge, and medium of benediction, became the occasion of divine infliction, come at once before our mind, in reading St. Paul's denouncement against unworthy communicants. It is remarkable only, that, in the latter case, the maledictory influence is more immediately connected with the thing profaned, than in the case of the ark. Doubtless, in both, we are to recognize the same agency. Yet in the statements respecting the ark, we perceive *that* agency more simply noted. The Lord smote the 'men of Ashdod.' 'The Lord smote the men of Bethshemesh, the Lord smote Uzzah.' Whereas, in the eucharist, the offender eats and drinks his own malediction. I make this remark, however, only to illustrate more strongly the equal, and similar sanctity of the Christian eucharist; because obvious propriety required a difference of expression. The ark could not, even by a figure of speech, be made the inflicter of punishment; but nothing was more natural than to make aliments, which had received a divine property through the supernatural blessing of heaven, to become of themselves, as it were, the vehicle of curse to him, who so eat or drank as to blend sanctity with pollution."

However little our readers may have acquiesced in these new views of Mr. Knox on the sacrament, they are, by this time, fully prepared to expect that, coming from Mr. Knox, they were fully convincing to Mr. Jebb, as we find from a short notice in a subsequent letter:

"Your argument from the the two-fold efficacy of the eucharistic elements, as implying, on the one hand, 'a taste of life,' (if one may transfer St. Paul's metaphor from one of the senses to another,) and, on the other hand, 'a taste of death,' to me is quite new, and very convincing; nor do I think it should by any means be omitted in any treatise you may prepare on the subject."

They are to us quite new indeed, but not at all convincing. The analogy attempted to be established between the elements in the sacrament and the ark, we think entirely fails. We know of no malediction conveyed by the symbols, when profaned, that bears any analogy to the judgment so awfully inflicted upon those who profaned the ark.

Upon this subject, Mr. Knox, A. D. 1824, printed and circulated privately a small volume, which is now before us, in which

he maintains that "*there is in this holy sacrament a peculiar effluence of supernatural grace, mysteriously united with the consecrated elements, so as to make them the vehicles of heavenly benediction to the capable communicant.*"

In another part of this little volume he states, that "*through the divine power, the visible signs become, for our spiritual benefit, supernaturally imbued with invisible virtue.*" And then he states, "*this virtue in the Lord's Supper is declared to be the body and blood of Christ.*" So that, according to him, the visible signs, that is, "the bread and wine," become supernaturally imbued with the body and blood of Christ. This is not, indeed, transubstantiation—it is not that the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ; but, whilst they remain bread and wine, they are supernaturally imbued with the body and blood of Christ. Surely this is nothing less than *consubstantiation*!

We are, upon mature deliberation, against the notion of those who hold that the sacrament is a bare memorial of the death of Christ. We believe it to be a time and a means for the communication and reception of divine grace; but we do certainly think it little less absurd than transubstantiation, and equally untrue, to say, that that spiritual grace is supernaturally infused into the elements, and so corporally received by those who take the bread and wine into their mouths. Yet this is the notion put forward, maintained by Mr. Knox, and assented to at once by Mr. Jebb.

Having been necessarily led to deal much with doctrinal points and speculative opinions, in which we did not agree with our authors, we feel much pleasure in inserting a beautiful little specimen of Christian submission, which we find in a letter of Mr. Knox's, dated July 4th, 1819:

"Your kind note received yesterday, ought not to remain one day unacknowledged, when a post-office is at hand, and when I can, I hope, venture to give you a somewhat more comfortable account of myself, than that which has reached you, and which occasioned your kind endeavour to cheer me. The fact is, that my general health is not worse, but I trust a good deal better. I certainly feel it so for the present, and am still dubious, only because disagreeable symptoms have not wholly gone off. At all events, the will of Providence must be right; therefore, whether I continue an invalid, as I have been now for a length of time, more or less, or have a more comfortable afternoon (rather evening) of life, than I have been looking forward to, I hope God will bless the one state, or enable me to make some good use of the other. I should be unreasonable and ungrateful in the extreme, if I were inclined to distrust that Providence, which has so mercifully guarded, guided, and sustained me through the part of life already passed; I am anxious only that my all-wise and all-gracious Benefactor may keep me pliant as wax to his moulding; and enable me to retain every impression, which he is pleased to give me. Then all will be well, let the course be that of continued restraint, or of increased liberty and corporal comfort. I know, from experience, that it is easier to bear the one, than to improve the other; but the strength which

was made perfect in St. Paul's weakness, continually taught him to be full, as well as to be hungry—to abound as effectually as to suffer need.

I certainly have had trying moments, during the last three months; not really from my actual state, but from my false reckoning of the symptoms which occurred. I have thought my uneasiness implied a fatal organic derangement. I have feared that what I felt in my head, would destroy my power of thinking. This was all pure misconception; but, for the time, it required inward support; and of this, I thank God, I never remained wholly in want. I know little, except in a very few now remote instances—I might say, nothing at all, of illapsive communication; and I hope I am not in error, when I say, that I have no desire for this. I prize incomparably more, an intelligible power (such, however, as divine animation and attraction could alone give) of fixing the mind and heart upon Him who is, at once, the parent of spirits and the fountain of comfort. To be able, not only to aim at this, but so to do it, as to find rest and satisfaction in doing it, and to feel all the faculties of the soul rectified and tranquillized by this central action of the inner man, this vital union of the human spirit with its God and Father, as, on the most rational principles, it is, at happier moments of the kind to which I refer, consciously felt to be—this, I confess, is the species of consolation in bodily distress, which I should be most anxious to obtain; and a dawning, I trust, of which was my only relief, when I thought I had nothing else to fly to.

This breathes a sweet spirit; and though savouring more of mystic, than evangelical piety, yet is refreshing and gratifying to us.

We draw near to a close. Our correspondents are advancing towards their end. In 1822, Mr. Jebb was consecrated Bishop of Limerick, an appointment certainly creditable to those who appointed him. He was not a person, holding the views that he did, that was likely to be a useful bishop of the Church of Ireland in such times as these; he was not a person likely to promote vigorous activity, or evangelical piety, according to the articles and homilies of the Church of England; but of his defects those who appointed him could not be supposed to be competent judges; and they evidently had no object in view, but to promote one whom they thought would be an ornament and an honour to the church. In a letter, dated July 22, 1823, we find Bishop Jebb mentioning his charge to his clergy, which he had desired to be sent to Mr. Knox:

“I have this day directed Milliken to send you and Mrs. L—— copies of my charge, which he published yesterday. I hope it is such as you will like, or, at least, not materially dislike. My earnest desire is, to promote, if I can, true serious clerical feeling in my diocese; and, what in these times is much wanting, ‘conciliation without compromise.’”

We shall give Mr. Knox's remarks upon the charge more at length:

“I have read your charge with attention; and it certainly has afforded me very real and cordial pleasure. The topics are all highly important;

and you treat them with forcible plainness, and an honesty of purpose, which cannot be misconstrued. I am not sure whether you could have taken any safer or more useful line, considering whom you had to address (so necessarily deficient in *precognita*) and how short a time you have been amongst them. As to the earlier topics, three things strike me, which perhaps might have been usefully adverted to; but even these, at least the first two, may possibly be put forward with more advantage hereafter; when, from personal conversations, a few, at least, may have become qualified to expound, and, it may be hoped, inclined to enforce, your official suggestions.

"My first desideratum is, that, in the fifth page, you should have more explicitly represented the spirit of Christianity itself, as the primary element, out of which the spirit of the Christian priesthood is to be sublimated. I conceive that a very brief preliminary observation to this purport, would have added strength, as well as clearness, to the just definition of the spirit of the Christian priesthood, which you proceeded to give. But you will think of it.

My second desideratum is, that you had, about your seventh page, urged, expressly, the studying the original text of the New Testament. I am aware that you did this by implication, p. 16th. But it is so very important a matter as to deserve both explanation and enforcement. I say explanation, for I suppose it is seldom adverted to, that no book in the world suffers so much in translation as the New Testament. The terms being so often, in great measure, untranslatable, and those the very terms of inspiration. But, as I said, I by no means lament that this point (in which I am confident of your agreeing with me) should remain in reserve.

My third desideratum, I mention more doubtingly, because the matter to which it refers, might, in the present state of the south, be rarely practicable. This is, that in psalmody, a few persons, who might be found capable and willing, should be taught to accompany, or perhaps rather supersede the clerk. Some clergymen could not do this, nor even, perhaps, procure means of having one. But others could, or their ladies could. I confess myself no admirer of the whole congregation making an effort to sing, *indocti doctique*. But the drawing of a solitary clerk, is, if possible, a worse extreme. The medium of a few, taught in some measure to sing, and the rest listening, appears to me to be in the appropriate spirit of the Church of England, as akin to choir-singing; while the congeniality of congregational singing, *rebus sic stantibus*, is at least disputable. But be this point ever so well worth attention, it may probably be better propounded in some other way than in your first charge. *Festina lentè*, is a capital maxim.

I cannot, at this moment, recollect a single particular urged by you, which was not necessary. What you insist upon, respecting the decorum of public worship, I cordially agree with.

I cannot express the pleasure afforded me, by what you said, p. 42, &c. The spirit which that part of the charge breathes, and the honest testimony which it so distinctly and manifestly bears to the R. C. clergy, is, I might almost say, delightful to me. The disposition manifested by so many, to allow them no credit for any thing, to charge them with invidiousness, and to represent them as secretly fomenting conspiracy in its bloodiest aspect,

has been long to me a matter of deep regret, and not a little alarm. For I have thought, if these men are at length made actually disloyal, by those harsh and implacable accusations of disloyalty, what will be the state of the country? For averting this calamity, I cannot conceive anything more promising than your coming forward, as you have done, to bear witness to their exertions, and to press the taking of them as allies, rather than the treating them as enemies. The line you draw between conciliation and compromise was indispensable. But had I been beside you, when you were drawing up your charge, I should have suggested, in one part, a somewhat different wording; instead of saying, 'that faith, which we are persuaded is the faith of the true catholic and apostolic church,' I think I should have said, 'what we conscientiously regard as the unadulterated faith and piety of the one catholic and apostolic church, in its best and purest times.' I mean, for the purpose of showing more clearly that no difference in the essence of Christian faith was intimated, between them and us; but that our charge against them was that of addition and admixture, which, though not actually destroying the vitality of faith, yet, in our conscientious judgment, has deeply impeded its influence, and dimmed its brightness. On this point, I persuade myself you and I have the same view; and I think you will agree with me, that, especially in this season of growing infidelity, (I have just been reading, and have not yet finished, the article on this subject in the last Quarterly Review, which I doubt not is Southey's,) it is as urgent a duty to recognize generical agreements, as it is, uncompromisingly to maintain specific differences. And I presume that just attention to the former duty, would, in some measure, smooth the way to that cooperation, in preserving 'good morals, good order, and public tranquillity,' which you have so happily recommended.

I certainly never was less sanguine in my hope of seeing Christian charity toward us, widely diffused among the R. C.'s than I am at present. Yet even now individuals may be softened; persevering liberality, in the true Christian sense, (Rom. xiv. 1, &c.) will be always gaining ground; while, as I already intimated, it may be a wise measure against infidels, who triumph so much in our disunion, to show, by word and deed, that the Church of England does not 'forsake and reject' the R. C. churches, 'in all things which they hold and practise; but have departed from them in those particular points only wherein they were fallen, both from themselves, in their ancient integrity, and from the apostolical churches, which were their first foundera.'

"I beg your pardon for making a quotation, which you know as well, and I am sure relish as much as I do. But I confess I always feel pleasure in adverting to that same 30th canon; which, by the way, may be thought, with some reason, to have more authority than any other canon, from its being recognized, as it is, in the rubric after the baptismal office.

"To all I have said, I must add, that what you said on the last topic (p. 50, &c.) gave me, even above every thing else, inexpressible pleasure. I assure you it was a cordial to my heart; and I trust the explicitness and strength with which you have thus, 'in limine,' declared your principles, and taken your stand, will bring down upon you the special blessing of God. I need not use many words to express to you my deep satisfaction in this un-

worldly avowal. You know all my views and feelings on the point; and I hope and believe you will also so well know my solicitude for your best interests, and your truest respectability and usefulness, that you can, as it were, look into my heart and see, with your mind's eye, the extent and depth of my gratification. I need only say further, that I like your manner as really as your matter. In my judgment, you managed the subject excellently. The quotation of the canon was as prudent as it was apposite; nothing could be better than the next paragraph, and I greatly approve of your concluding observations."

We need hardly reiterate our total and heartfelt dissent from all that Mr. Knox has said here about the Roman Catholics. The man that could say such things was no Protestant in the proper sense and bearing of the word. He was no Protestant who would suggest an alteration in a passage "for the purpose of showing more clearly that no difference in the essence of faith was intimated between them and us. Had this been the opinion of our Reformers, that could never have justified their separation from the Church of Rome. Our protest against the Church of Rome is grounded upon the very opposite of that which Mr. Knox here put forward, namely, that there is a difference in the essence of faith between them and us.

Under date of March, 1824, there is a letter of Mr. Knox's, with remarks upon Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, and a comparison of his times with our own, which we should have great pleasure in transcribing, but for its length. There is, however, one paragraph in which this friend of Roman Catholics, both in a political and religious point of view, speaks so sensibly, so prophetically of the ruinous effects of the complying spirit which will stain the character of the statesmen of that day, and which is now our ruin and our scourge, that we must give it to our readers:

"The exact parallel of those unhappy times can hardly again recur: but principles too near akin to those out of which those commotions originated, are undoubtedly once more in operation; and from their wide diffusion, and obvious influence on public counsels, may, in the issue, lead to consequences very different from what such men as Lord Liverpool, and Mr. Goulburn, would wish to facilitate. There was, in the commencement and progress of those former troubles, a concurrence of sectarians and infidels, in making war on the church. I wish there were nothing of the same kind at this day. The Roman Catholics in Ireland had their great share in embroiling the fray then: the part they are now permitted, and by their parliamentary abettors encouraged to act, allowing for circumstantial difference, is, in spirit, strangely similar. In listening to Clarendon, I wondered at the sameness of disposition and temper; while there can be no doubt that their present power of doing mischief, bears no shadow of comparison with that of their predecessors; and, I think, would at this day be nothing, if Lord Cornwallis and Lord Castlereagh had not been thwarted, in their plan of political amalgamation. Providence ordered things otherwise; for what ulterior purposes, time will show. As things are, they would of themselves be able to do little other mischief than what we have experienced already within the last years; but that, in their present factious form and spirit, they should have access to Parliament, and be permitted to vent their malice and obloquy through the medium of a petition, and; above all, have in that assembly advocates of their extravagant claims, implies such a portentous state of things, as to add sensibly to my satisfaction in being now in my

sixty-seventh year, and in having no peculiar objects of anxiety to leave behind me in this world.

"I am sure all things will eventually serve the sublime purposes of divine philanthropy; but it is awful to think of the providential measures, which, arguing from the past to the future, we may imagine likely to intervene. I, therefore, almost tremble to mark the complying spirit of our statesmen; as I fear, however sincerely they may wish to fix a *ne plus ultra*, they will, at every fresh conciliatory, or rather compromising step, find it less practicable, and even less rationally maintainable. In short, I am not without fear that the Church of Ireland will eventually be sacrificed to the preservation of what will be considered central integrity. But sure I am, that if the one church goes, the other will soon follow; and what the political constitution will then become, I only wish they might now have the prudence and the sagacity, to make a matter of grave consideration."

This really has in it almost the spirit of prophecy. It is now ten years since this was written; and how have its fearful anticipations been realized! How has the sinful, cowardly spirit of conciliation proceeded, creating, instead of satisfying demands!

We must now close our quotations, which we fear that our readers will already think too long. But, in truth, we consider a liberal quantity of quotations, if fairly made, the best mode of giving a just estimate of any author. The latter part of the volume presents nothing worth extracting. Mr. Knox grew old and feeble; and, in 1827, the bishop had an attack of paralysis, under the effect of which he suffered to the close of his life. We cannot but regret much, in the later letters of these two amiable men, the absence of those matured and glowing expressions of religious hope and faith which might have been expected from advanced Christians. There is something to us very melancholy and humbling in the latter days of Bishop Jebb. They force us to think of those declining days of the truly pious Cowper, when his diseased and weakened mind was just kept from preying upon itself by being employed in the translation of Homer. So it is melancholy to find the weakened mind of Bishop Jebb just kept amused by editing various works of no great value. We felt much for the weak state to which every mortal is liable to be reduced, when we read, dated March 20, 1830,

"I have finished printing two volumes, each upwards of 400 pages, and expect to be out in a fortnight. Every proof and revise I corrected with my own left hand."

At the conclusion of our review we are even more settled in our judgment, that this correspondence should never have been published. The one that certainly shines most in it is Mr. Knox. Yet in our judgment it gives a very inadequate idea of his talents, which undoubtedly were great, and it cannot fail to leave the enlightened reader under a most unpleasant impression as to the correctness of his creed, and the sterling nature of his piety. As to the other writer, Bishop Jebb, we certainly are surprised how the correspondence should ever have been published by his friend, except that that friend is evidently a man totally devoid of judgment and discernment. Jebb certainly appears in a character of very marked inferiority; and this correspondence takes from him a great portion of the credit given to him for that work which

alone will give him a name, his Sacred Literature; a large share of the merit of that work belongs to Mr. Knox. In religion he was, indeed, a follower; he took up uniformly all Mr. Knox's errors, and appears to have fallen short of him in the life and animation with which he exhibited that portion of truth which they both held.

But there is one point of view in which the publication, though not creditable to the authors, may be valuable to the readers. It is a faithful exhibition of matter of fact. We are allowed to see these men as they really were. We can judge of their religious system by its effects.

They appear before us as men of great amiability, undoubted talent, much reading, much thought, deliberately choosing a peculiar walk in religion for themselves, freely condemning all others, and assuming to themselves a privileged superiority over every class of professors. But what do these two large volumes exhibit in this respect? Do they exhibit the path of the just shining more and more unto the perfect day? Do their latter letters, those written under the pressure of illness and in the approaching close of life, exhibit a strengthened faith, an increasing hope, a warmed love? Do they exhibit growing victory over the world, and more holy elevation? By no means. Their sun was in its greatest brightness when it rose, and its setting was behind clouds, which at least shed a darkness and obscurity around the evening of their lives. As far as this correspondence represents them to our view, there is no brightness in their latter end. There is no going on from strength to strength; no apparent ripening for glory. No, there is nothing, when the reader closes these volumes to make him cry out, "Let me die their death; let my latter end be like theirs." But whilst from these volumes the reader will derive no profit in the way of direction to the higher paths of spiritual religion, he may derive profit, if he takes the warning they are eminently calculated to give. There is in the correspondence no feature more prominent than the expression of aversion towards those denominated Calvinists or Evangelicals. They are set down as a lower class of religionists, to be tolerated and pitied; men who have substituted "speculative faith" for vital godliness and elevating holiness. But how far do these men of "speculative comfort" excel our authors in the constant exhibition of soul-stirring piety! We know nothing that has been published, in either former or later times, professing to give the interior life of any of these Evangelicals, Calvinists, or Biblicals, whom our authors so much despised, that does not show them to to have had, along with their speculative comfort and doctrinal faith, infinitely more of spiritual mindedness, infinitely more of imparted holiness, than these men, who cried down the work of the Saviour *for* man, with the professed object of exalting the work of God *in* man. This last is the way, no doubt, which human wisdom would suggest for promoting holiness; but God's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts. Forensic justification is not only a doctrine of peace and according to truth, but a doctrine producing HOLINESS.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,
AND
Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXXVII. NOVEMBER, 1834. Vol. III.

THE ISRAELITES' JOURNEY FROM EGYPT TO
CANAAN, A TYPE OF THE CHRISTIAN'S EARTHLY
PILGRIMAGE—A SERMON.

BY THE REV. HUGH WHITE, A. M.

“Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples, and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.”—1 Cor. x. 11.

How strange and interesting is the history of the Jews, to whatever period of that history we direct our attention! Look at them, as the chosen people of God, distinguished above all the nations of the earth, as the objects of Jehovah's peculiar care; the depositories of His revealed will; having the light of the knowledge of the true God shining in their dwellings, while all the world around was plunged in the darkness of idolatry—a darkness so gross that it might be felt. Contemplate them as the people on whom the highest external honor was conferred that could be conferred on any people, even that “of them, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all! God blessed for ever!” And what an intense interest for the Jews should ever be awakened in a Christian's breast by the single fact, that the Saviour of the world was Himself a Jew!

Review their melancholy and mysterious history since their rejection of the Son of God: a people scattered over the face of the whole earth—a proverb and a byword among the nations—the objects of continued scorn, and insult, and persecution, for eighteen hundred years—and still preserved a distinct, peculiar, imperishable people—like the bush on Horeb's Mount, still burning with the fire of Divine indignation, yet still uncon-

sumed! Or, finally, look forward to the bright and glorious scenes which the page of prophecy unfolds, as reserved for this wondrous people, whose future destinies are so inseparably linked with the future prospects of the Church of Christ; and in whichever of these lights we view them, are they not a people, whose history, for all that is striking and solemn, the warnings it lifts up, and the instruction it supplies, is confessedly unparalleled in the annals of our world!

It is not, however, my purpose at present to pursue this subject, however deeply interesting. I have thus briefly glanced at it, in hopes of stirring up the minds of Christians to its more attentive investigation. I would now confine myself to that portion of the history of this extraordinary people, which extends from their captivity in Egypt, to their entrance into the promised land, as strikingly illustrative of the believer's history, during his journey through this land of his pilgrimage, to his promised inheritance above.

May the Eternal Spirit, by His divine teaching, abundantly bless the consideration of this subject to the spiritual welfare of our immortal souls.

Let us look, then, to the children of Israel, groaning under the galling burthen of Egyptian bondage; grievously afflicted by cruel taskmasters, and unmercifully oppressed by a relentless tyrant. How affecting, yet how faint an emblem of the believer's natural state, before the grace of God has delivered him from the bondage of sin, and the tyranny of Satan! I say, how faint! for, in truth, the bondage of Egyptian slavery was a light yoke, compared with the bondage of sin; and Pharaoh a merciful tyrant, compared with Satan! Oh, the unutterable degradation of that slavery, by which the energies of an immortal spirit, that ought to aspire to the substantial glories of eternity, are chained down to the shadowy trifles of time; and the affections, that ought to soar up to Heaven, lie grovelling in the dust; and the faculties, that ought to be rejoicingly put forth, to promote His glory, whose service is perfect freedom, and perfect happiness, are compelled to toil and weary themselves, as the veriest drudges, at the bidding of those cruellest of taskmasters, the world, the flesh, and the devil! Oh! the unspeakable torment of that tyranny, which Satan exercises over his slaves! hurried along by lusts and passions, which reason condemns, but cannot control; and indulgence, so far from satisfying, only inflames; while their wretched victim, amidst the shame of self-contempt, which he may conceal, but cannot conquer, and the upbraidings of self-condemnation, which, however he may stifle, he cannot silence, is forced to drag along a galling chain, whose iron enters into his soul, and which, with a weight, becoming every day more insupportable, so drags him down to earth, that he never desires or dares to raise one upward look to Heaven, but sinks, in hopeless, helpless, debasement of spirit, down to the level—yea, below the level of the beasts that perish!

But at length a day of deliverance arrives! "Surely I have seen, saith the Lord, the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry, by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows! and I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey!"

Is it not thus, that when there was no human eye compassionate enough to pity, and no human arm strong enough to save, the Lord Himself looked down out of heaven, with an eye of pitying compassion, when He saw the affliction of His people, groaning under the bondage of Satan, and heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters—and "His soul was grieved for the misery of Israel!" Nor did He look or listen with unavailing sympathy! The sight of their sorrow—the cry of their anguish—pierced, as it were, His inmost soul; stirred up in His bosom all the depths of divine love; and drew Him down from the throne of His glory, to be the deliverer of His people; the Redeemer of His Israel. He saw that no arm of flesh could rescue them from their captivity; therefore His own Almighty arm, ~~it~~ brought salvation! He knew that no power of earth could emancipate them from their bondage; therefore, (oh! wondrous love!) He came down Himself from heaven, to deliver them; and to bring them into a good land, and a large, even a land flowing with an inexhaustible abundance of all that can nourish, refresh, and gladden the soul of man!

And how strikingly illustrative of the means employed for His people's deliverance, was that vouchsafed to Israel of old! The Paschal Lamb was slain, and its blood was sprinkled on the door-posts of the houses of the children of Israel; and wherever this sacred symbol of Divine mercy was seen, the destroying angel passed by, and the inhabitants of that house were safe! It was, indeed, a night to be much remembered of that people! And it is an hour to be much and gratefully remembered by the believer, (not merely through the days of time, but throughout the ages of eternity,) when first, through a living faith in Christ, our Passover, he goes forth from the land of captivity, and the house of bondage, protected from the destroying stroke of God's righteous wrath—the flaming sword of God's offended justice—by the sprinkling on his soul of that blood of the Lamb, which covereth and blotteth out all his sins, and seals him for eternal salvation. And then, like the Israelite of old, safe with this mark of covenant mercy on his soul, trusting to the guidance of his great deliverer, he enters on that journey which will conduct him at last, to the promised land of his inheritance! the Canaan above!

But no sooner were the people of Israel escaped out of the hands of the Egyptians, than Pharaoh, with all his hosts, pursued after them! Even thus does Satan, with all the confederate hosts of hell, pursue after the believer, when rescued from his

power by the great Captain of Salvation, and use every artifice and exertion which diabolical malice and subtlety can suggest, to drag him back again into the captivity from which he has been just released. Like Pharaoh, the tyrant of hell, who is enraged to see his prey snatched from his grasp, puts forth all his power, and musters all his forces, to recover the captive he has lost.

Look now to Israel, trembling with overwhelming alarm, when they see the Egyptians, with all their horses and chariots, pursuing after them; inaccessible mountains hemming them in on either side; and the sea, with its impassable barrier of waves, rolling before them!

Do you not here see a striking emblem of the situation and feelings of the believer, when, on first escaping from Satan's bondage, he beholds all the powers of darkness—all the enemies of his soul, the flesh, the world, and the devil, pursuing him with relentless rage; mountains of difficulty encompassing him on every side; and before him seas of danger and temptation, lifting up their high tempestuous waves, threatening to engulf him!

Is there here any individual who feels this to be his own case? I would say to that individual, as God said to His people of old, "Fear not! go forward!" Go forward courageously, in the name and strength of your God! The Deliverer in whom you trust is Almighty; He will make a way through those seas of danger, for his ransomed to pass over, so that the very waves you so much fear, shall be as a wall of defence on your right hand, and your left. While the Lord is your protector, Satan cannot wrest you from His hands, till he has first conquered the Almighty. Look yet again, timid, trembling believer! look at the shore of the Red Sea, strewn with the carcasses of Pharaoh and all his hosts!—See in their destruction the pledge of the destruction of all your enemies! for they are the enemies of Israel's God. Go forward, then, I say, with holy courage, cheered amid all the dangers of your journey by the animating thought, how soon, standing on that peaceful shore, which no sound of alarm from angry storms, or threatening foes, can ever reach, you shall see all your enemies plunged in the depths of that sea, whose waves burn with fire unquenchable. There soon shall you take up, in holy triumph, the song of Moses and the Lamb, exclaiming in adoring gratitude, "I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously! The Lord is my strength and my song, and he is become my salvation! Thy right hand, oh, Lord, hath dashed to pieces the enemy! Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people whom thou hast redeemed! Thou hast guided them in thy strength, unto this thy holy habitation! Therefore be honor, and glory, and praise, and power, unto thee our God, and unto the Lamb—even the Lamb that was slain for us, for ever and ever. Amen."

Behold now the people of Israel, rescued from the threatened danger, pursuing their journey to the promised land! But mark!

they do not at once go in to possess the land ; but are led, during a pilgrimage of many years, through a wilderness. And is it not even so with the believer ? Does not his journey to the heavenly Canaan lie through a wilderness ? Yes, my friends, this world ~~is~~ a wilderness. It was once the garden of the Lord !—the paradise of God !—where, in the morning of his innocence, man walked with God in holy and happy fellowship, even as one walketh with a friend ; but, in evil hour, sin entered into it, and made it a wilderness indeed. And what are now its brightest and most boasted pleasures, but the short-lived flowers of the desert, that look beautiful to the eye, but crumble in our grasp when we attempt to seize them ! And what are its most tempting and trusted promises of hope or consolation, but the deceitful springs of the desert, which from afar gleam upon and gladden the thirsty traveller's gaze, but as soon as he reaches them and stoops to drink, like a dream, when one awaketh, they are gone. Still, wilderness as this world is, *one* thought reconciles the believer to all its scenes of sorrow—he is but a pilgrim and a stranger here, journeying through it to a better country, that is, a heavenly ! His path is indeed through a desert ; but his home, and therefore his heart and happiness are above, in that “good land beyond Jordan,” which he shall reach when his wanderings through the wilderness are past ; and this thought enables him to journey on with a cheerful spirit, and a buoyant step ! And while journeying along, he has meat to nourish him, and water to refresh him, which the world knows not of, and of which the manna, and the water that gushed from Horeb's smitten rock, were most appropriate and beautiful emblems.

This is not a fanciful or unwarranted declaration. “I,” says Jesus, (with a manifest allusion to the manna,) “am the living bread, which came down from heaven ; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.” And St. Paul tells us, “All the Israelites drank of the spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ.” How many important reflections do these beautiful types of the bread and water of life suggest ! As the people of Israel were miraculously sustained, during their journey through the wilderness, to humble and to prove them, by reminding them continually of their absolute and uninterrupted dependance on their God, even so is the believer's spiritual life, during the entire of his journey through this world's wilderness, (in order to teach him the same lesson,) supernaturally sustained by that bread of life which cometh down from heaven, and that water of life which gushes, ever-fresh, from the smitten Rock of his salvation. Observe this, believer. The wilderness of old supplied no food to the Israelites, nor had any Israelite aught to spare for any fellow-traveller's support. All must receive their support from heaven, and each only received sufficient for himself. Even thus, remember, this world supplies no spiritual food. The manna for the soul cannot be found in the wilderness ; you must receive it direct from heaven ; nor can any

fellow-believer impart to you from his store. Each only receives sufficient for the nourishment of his own soul. Nor will the spiritual manna, any more than that of old, keep from day to day. Each morning must find you, by deep and devout meditation on a Saviour's love, and humble fervent supplication for a Saviour's grace, gathering in a fresh supply of the heavenly manna for the nourishment of your soul throughout the day. Yesterday's supply of grace was only sufficient for the wants of yesterday. Each morning you must offer up that heaven-taught prayer, (and your God will gladly grant the petition of the prayer of faith,) "Give us this day our daily bread."

It is well, believer, that you must thus incessantly be a suppliant at the throne of grace—that you are allowed no stored-up stock of grace, on which to live. This living on the daily alms of God's bounty has a powerful tendency to keep you humble, and thus safe and happy. For all your strength, security, and comfort, consist in that constantly remembered, and deeply felt sense of your own helplessness and emptiness, which links you, by prayer, even with the omnipotence and all-sufficiency of Jehovah; supports your helplessness on his almighty arm; and fills your emptiness with all the fullness of God.

And whenever, from the pressure of temptation, the weight of sorrow, or the far heavier burden of indwelling sin, your spirit begins to droop, and your soul to faint within you, oh! look not for refreshment to any of those broken cisterns of earth, which can hold no really refreshing water; but flee unto the Rock of Ages, which was once smitten by the rod of the Father's wrath for your salvation, and drink deep of the water of life which that Rock supplies. There is no thirst for satisfying happiness that the human heart can feel, which that water cannot quench—no faintness under affliction, from which it cannot revive the sinking soul! No matter what the pressure of your sorrow, however long bowed down, or deeply crushed, your spirit may have been, one draught of that life-giving stream will enable you to lift up your drooping head, and go on your heavenward way rejoicing! Surely, believer, it must be your own fault, if you often feel weak or weary, while travelling through the wilderness, when you have *such* bread to strengthen, and *such* water to refresh you, on your way.

And as your guide in that heavenward way, have you not, like the people of Israel of old, a glorious light from heaven, to direct and brighten out your path through the wilderness, to the promised land? Is not the pillar of the divine presence pledged to accompany you throughout your journey, as a screening cloud to shelter you from the scorching heat in the day-time of prosperity, and a pillar of fire, to give you light, in the night-time of affliction? Does not this light rest on your tabernacle, hallowing it with the manifested tokens of the glory of God? Is not the Holy Spirit, shining on the sacred pages of God's revealed Word, making its precepts clear, and its promises precious, your

Heavenly Guide? Seek then earnestly, I beseech of you, believer, the guidance of this celestial light, and follow, courageously and cheerfully, wherever it points the way. Trust me, it will never mislead you. The way it marks out is the *only way of safety*—the way of duty—of self-denial—of holiness—the way in which Christ your forerunner walked—the way of peace—the way that alone leads to everlasting life! It may be a rough, but still it is a right way to the city of habitation. It may be thorny. Such was the path your Divine Master, the Man of Sorrows, trod before you! Can you complain, if you are called on to follow His steps, and, like Him, to pass through suffering to glory? Remember, for your comfort, though your pathway through the wilderness may be overshadowed with the deepest gloom of earthly tribulation, still to the eye of faith, while following the guidance of the Holy Spirit, it will be brightened by a Saviour's smile! and after a few more days and nights of weariness and pain are past, will conduct you to the unclouded sunshine of a Saviour's presence! Can you complain of any path, that will at last lead and leave you *there*?

True, as Israel of old had to pass over Jordan, to go in, and possess the promised land, so must you pass over the dark river of death, to reach the land of your inheritance. But fear not, when Jesus calls you, to go down into the river. He has promised, "When thou passest through the river, I will be with thee, so that the waters shall not overwhelm thee." Amidst the swellings of Jordan, the great High Priest of your profession, who has passed over it before you, will Himself be with you, to guide, uphold, and comfort you! The waters may be dark, but His smile will irradiate them! The waves may be tempestuous, but His Spirit will tranquillize them! The river may be deep, but His arm will guide you safely through it! And when you reach the opposite bank, believer, and touch the borders of the Heavenly Canaan, oh! what a welcome waits you there! He who has loved you with an everlasting love—He who Himself came down from Heaven, to deliver you from the bondage of sin and Satan—He who guided and guarded you, with all a Saviour's tenderness and care, all your way through the wilderness—He who was once crowned with thorns, that you might be crowned with glory, and was lifted up upon a cross on earth, that you might be lifted up on a throne in heaven—He, even He Himself, will meet you, and welcome you with a Saviour's smile of unutterable love, to the inheritance of everlasting rest and blessedness, which he has purchased for you with His own infinitely precious blood. What will be the joy of that first moment of meeting between your redeemed spirit and its Redeemer! What will you feel of bliss ineffable, when for the first time you see the Saviour face to face!—see His smile beaming on your emancipated spirit!—for the first time hear His voice, welcoming you to your inheritance of eternal rest!—cast for the first time your blood-bought crown at His feet!—and lift up your first song of praise and thanksgiving,

in grateful adoration, before His throne ! What will be the bliss of that first moment of meeting with Jesus, eye hath not seen, ear hath not heard, neither hath it entered even into the believer's heart on earth to conceive ! Oh ! is there any depth or duration of sorrows, any anguish or weariness of spirit, that could be experienced, while wandering through the wilderness, which the rapture of that moment would not abundantly repay ? And then to think of an everlasting communion with the Saviour, *as sweet* as what will be that moment enjoyed !—yea, everlastingly increasing in sweetness ! while, as the ages of eternity are rolling on, the glorified spirit will be continually drinking deeper and yet deeper draughts of pure and satisfying felicity from the Fountain Head of glory and of bliss ! Believer, is such the inheritance reserved for you in the heavenly Canaan ? *What* then should be your feelings, and *how* should they be embodied in your life, towards Him who has prepared it for you, in the riches of His sovereign grace, and purchased it for you at the price of His precious blood.

I cannot conclude without entreating you to ask yourselves individually the few following simple questions, suggested by the subject we have been considering : “ Have I felt the burthen of the bondage of sin, and the yoke of Satan, altogether intolerable ? and, in the anguish of my soul, cried out to that Almighty Redeemer, who is alike willing and able to deliver me from this most debasing bondage, and most galling yoke ? Has the sin-atoning, sin-cleansing blood of the Lamb been sprinkled on my soul ? And with this mark of covenant mercy securing me from wrath, and sealing me for salvation, have I set out on my heavenward journey ; and am I now living as a pilgrim and stranger upon earth, with my heart, my hopes, my happiness, fixed on things above ? Do I daily feed, by faith, on the bread of life, and drink, by faith, of the water of life, which Jesus can alone supply ? Does the pillar of the Divine Presence accompany me, and the light of the Holy Spirit guide me, in my pathway through the wilderness, to the Canaan above ? And have I a well-grounded confidence, that when I have crossed the dark river of death, I shall reach that blessed land, where there remaineth a rest for the children of God, to spend there a happy eternity, in communion with Him, in whose presence is fulness of joy, and at whose right hand are pleasures for evermore.”

THOUGHTS AND REFLECTIONS.

I. ON THE HAPPINESS AND TRIALS OF THE CHRISTIAN.

THAT true religion is substantial happiness, the Scriptures clearly and unequivocally set forth. It is described as a peace of God, which passeth all understanding—as a well of water, springing up into everlasting life—as joy in the Holy Ghost—as the kingdom of heaven within us. On the other hand, the believer is often represented as one who passes through much tribulation, and whose calling it is, to endure hardness, and afflictions, to bear his cross, and to suffer with Christ. How then are we to reconcile these apparent contradictions? How can religion be happiness, and still the religious man be exposed to so much misery? In answer to this, I would observe, that the soul, like the body, is subject to two distinct kinds of suffering. If a man lies upon his bed and feels in pain, this pain may arise from one of two causes, either from what is outward and accidental, or from what is inward, and indicative of disease. Should it proceed, for instance, from uneasiness of posture; or from any thing hard, or sharp-pointed in the bed, he has only to rise, or shift his position, and all will be well. But if the pain originate in no such cause, he has then ascertained that his body is, more or less, disordered; and that, till a more radical remedy be found, he will, in spite of change of place, or posture, carry his pain along with him. So it is with the soul. The happiness which religion imparts is moral soundness, and spiritual health. But there are afflictions against which the most perfect sanity of soul is no security. The great Physician cures all inward maladies; and this is the happiness which he both promises, and gives, to those who come to him. Nevertheless they, like others, are born to trouble as the sparks fly upward. The difference is, that in the one case there is disease within; and to whatever regions that soul may travel, it will carry with it the worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched. In the other case, the soul is healthful, and is in itself a happy being. All its sufferings arise from accidental hindrances, and foreign causes; and, therefore, when it leaves the body, and passes into brighter regions, it will bid farewell for ever, to pain, and sorrow.

II. ON THE APPARENT INCREDIBILITY OF SCRIPTURE MIRACLES.

There are various miracles recorded in Scripture, as in the instances of Gideon and Samson, which appear startling to many minds. But I believe that this arises from the habit of considering them, insensibly to ourselves, as inventions rather than as facts. And here an important distinction is to be made. If we

view such an account, for example, as that of Samson destroying a thousand Philistines with the jaw-bone of ass, in the light of an artificial story, nothing can be more ludicrous. No writer, who had a fiction to invent, could have put so whimsical and unaccountable a weapon into his hero's hand, for any purpose but that of turning him into ridicule. But only consider the relation to be a real fact. Suppose yourself an eye-witness of the scene. Suppose you beheld the Israelitish champion, alone and unarmed, in the midst of a hostile multitude; that you saw him, as it were, visited by an inspiration which elevated him above mortal courage, or mortal power; that you saw him in this state of supernatural excitement, cast about him for some instrument of defence; that none presents itself but the weapon recorded; that he seizes it, and lays a thousand enemies prostrate at his feet. Thus the whole action, almost in exact proportion as it would be ludicrous in fiction, rises, as a reality, into the truest sublime.

III. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND CHURCH OF ROME COMPARED.

During the last three or four years, our church has been, in temporal matters, impoverished and depressed. It has been out of fashion, and out of credit with the world; and as to future prospects, it holds out none but what are altogether discouraging, if not hopeless, to the man who, not to speak of honors, would look to the clerical profession for a decent maintenance. Nevertheless, at no period have there been amongst us so many candidates for orders, all from the higher, and some from the highest, ranks of society. With all our faults, and sins, upon our heads, this speaks well for us. But how has it been with the church of Rome? Centuries of opportunity have been allowed her, in this country, to manifest the same disinterestedness and zeal. She was long discountenanced and depressed. And did any of her nobility, and gentry, so far own her, in her tribulation, as to devote their sons or relatives to the service of the altar? No. The "evil way" of Jeroboam was the uniform practice of the church of Rome. They "made of the lowest of the people, priests of the high places." Now their opportunity of doing as we have done, is past. They never can wipe away this stain. If gentlemen *now* begin to assume the priestly office amongst them, it will be manifest that it is merely because the sun of worldly favour is rising on their church.

IV. ON BEING ASHAMED OF CHRIST.

It is a remarkable and melancholy fact that Christianity has generated in the human breast a new sense or passion, namely, that of being ashamed of God. That men should view the Almighty with terror and alarm; that they should be vain or

boastful of his supposed favours; that the wicked should hate Him for his purity: nay, that the fool should say in his heart, there is no God: all this is more or less accountable. But that worms of the earth should be ashamed of that Being whom all the angels worship, is what we might well conceive impossible, were not its existence too palpably proved by facts. The proofs are before our eyes; for, wonderful to say, this strange fatuity is to be found amongst the professors of the pure Gospel of Christ, and amongst them alone. And thus, while the votaries of the most senseless superstitions glory in their shame, the worshippers of the true God are ashamed of their glory. In ancient Greece and Rome the gods were honored with open and ostentatious display. Amongst the Hindoo and other nations of the East, religious rites are matters of pomp and magnificent parade. The Mahometan boasts of the unity of God, and glories in the name of the false prophet. The Jews performed their devotions in the corners of the streets, and for a pretence made long prayers. The Romanist carries the host in triumph through the public ways. It is, in a word, the professors of the true faith alone who know what it is to be ashamed of their religion. Whence this cowardice—this proneness in the soldiers of the cross to desert their standard? It is because their standard is the cross. Other religions are “of the world.” They tread with confidence, because they tread on friendly ground. But the Captain of our salvation was despised and crucified. The religion which he taught, is a religion of purity, of humility, and of deadness to the world. It is opposed to, and hy, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life. This then is the reason why so many who are called Christians are ashamed of their religion and their God; and are unwilling, by a bold confession, to draw upon themselves the scorn and enmity of a proud and sensual world.

V. ON THE ORIGIN OF EVIL.

May not the origin of evil be as follows? God alone is, as our Saviour tells us, good: that is, absolute unmingled goodness. When God willed the existence of rational intelligencies distinct from himself, it was necessary, by some means, to sever from the parent source or fountain those souls, or spiritual principles, which are “all his offspring.” As in the animal life, the parent physically and locally expels her offspring from herself, that they may become separate and independent existencies; so it was necessary, in order that the creature should be a distinct individual, and no longer, as it were, a part of God, that some principle of separation should sever between them. But as God is essentially moral, and absolute goodness, nothing but moral evil could separate any portion of spirit from him. When the separating principle has, if I may so speak, individualized the

creature, it may then be depurated, and return to God, by a moral assimilation, without returning again to its original union with his essence.

VI. ON THE TENDENCY OF RELIGION TO UNITE, AND OF
IRRELIGION TO DISUNITE.

It is remarkable how worldly habits cut off the several branches of the human family from each other; and, on the other hand, how true religion links them together, and brings them into one. Many proofs of this might be given, but I shall content myself with a single instance. From the earliest youth to the latest age, the children of this world seem, at every stage of their advance, to lose all sympathy of feeling, and all community of interest, with the classes which they successively leave behind them. Thus the schoolboy, proud of cruelty and coarseness, disdains the nursery, and scorns the simplicity of what he now calls children. In like manner the college youth, advanced to maturer vices, throws off the companionship of the schoolboy, and considers his familiarity as impertinence. Again, the man who has entered the lists, and become a candidate for the high prizes of ambition, has lost all relish for the things he loved at college, and consequently, all sympathy with those who love them still. In this manner does the work of division progress, till the wheel goes round; till old age meets the weakness and folly of infancy again, and is shoved off the stage as useless lumber. Oh, how different from that blessed union of hearts, and minds, and tastes, which binds together the whole family of God, whether "babes, or young men, or fathers." Their innocent and harmless pleasures are suitable to regenerate man, at every stage of life. In childhood, in manhood, or in "a good old age," the pure in heart can see God amidst the scenes of nature; and walk together in the same ways of pleasantness, and paths of peace. All, without distinction, can join in calling the Sabbath a delight, and feel equal gladness when it is said unto them, "We will go into the house of the Lord." Young men and maidens, old men and children, "all eat the same spiritual meat, and all drink the same spiritual drink." There may be varieties, but there is no essential difference. They all walk in the same light: and though it be to one the morning, and to another the meridian, or the evening of his days, it is the same sun of righteousness which shines upon them all.

Such is the contrast which holds throughout between the children of this world, and the children of light. Amongst the former there is no real bond of union. They are out of the sphere of God's attraction; nor, consequently, is there any attraction of cohesion, which links them to each other. They belong to a system, if such it can be called, which is hastening to decay; for "a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand; but hath an end." On the other hand, the children of the light

are all drawn by God, and that attraction binds them in mutual fellowship and love. In answer to their Saviour's prayer, they "all are one:" one, after the image of God's unity, and consequently, of his eternity; for that which is indissolubly united, will last for ever. They are all citizens of that Jerusalem above, which, like her earthly counterpart, is built as a city at unity in itself: that unity of which we learn both the cause and the effect in those other expressions of the Psalmist, "God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved."

VII. ON THE CHURCH OF ROME, AND THE THEATRE.

It has often been a matter of surprise that the Church of Rome, liberal as it is in its allowance of other amusements, should so pointedly oppose the theatre; and should even deny the rites of burial to all performers on the stage. It appears to me, however, not difficult to assign the reason. It is an old proverb that "two of a trade never agree." There is, in fact, a close resemblance between Popery and the stage. The Church of Rome is dramatic in all its features. It seems to be its office, and its very essence to *act* Christianity, and to hold out in exterior exhibition that which, in its true life, no eye but God's can see. No wonder the Church of Rome is fond of sacraments, when the definition of one so admirably suits herself—she is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual church." It is, in a word, as I said before, her part and province to *act* Christianity. Thus, with her, repentance is changed to penance—because the latter is to *act* the former. Thus to glory in the cross of Christ is, with her, to kiss, and kneel to, and carry in procession, a material crucifix. Thus our Lord's humility, in washing his disciples' feet, is, with her, *got up* as a grand *performance*, in which the Pope annually *acts the part* of Christ. In full keeping with all this, the celebration of the mass is an apparatus, calculated altogether to engage the senses. Artificial lights, odoriferous incense, enchanting music, costly decorations, and all the secret charms of mystery—such are the stimulants with which the worship of the mass supplies the place of rational and spiritual devotion. But still all these fall short of the brilliancy and attractions of the theatre. The glare of the theatre outshines the gaudiness of the church, and brings a whole apparatus to bear upon the senses, which prudence, if no better principle, forbids the latter to employ. Hence the jealousy of the Church of Rome. The theatre is her rival, and as such she fears her. She dreads her, and denounces her as an enemy who meets her on her own ground, and who encroaches on her own immediate province, namely, that of exciting the passions, and acting on the senses of mankind.

H. W.

ON COMMITTEES OF RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

YOUR periodical furnishes an occasional article in reference to the committees of religious societies, and I am willing, with your permission, to make an addition to the number, under an impression, founded in experience, that there is great room for improvement. It has been my lot to be a committee-man; and, as such, I had the privilege of being behind the scenes, and of viewing the nakedness of the land. I lament that the routine of business on such occasions, is devoid of unction; and that men, who profess to be the Lord's people, in approaching the details of operations brought under their notice, seem to lay aside their spirituality on entering the committee-room. And I verily believe that, owing to this glaring defect, some eminently pious and devoted servants of the Lord are unwilling to take an active part as members of a committee, though warmly attached to the cause, and otherwise zealously engaged in "works of faith and labours of love. The meetings open, no doubt, with prayer; but does a watchful prayerful spirit keep pace with the proceedings? When we come to the consideration, among other things, of pounds, shillings, and pence, we should not lose sight of the fact, that we are Christians; and we are too apt to forget an Apostle's exhortation: "Whether, therefore, ye eat, or drink, or *whatsoever ye do*, do all to the glory of God." In this great metropolis, there are religious societies, and, of course, committees without number. Let the members, each for himself, take even a cursory glance at the interior of a committee-room, when they meet in conclave, and, I am confident, they will have reason to say that I have not borne false witness. While I am upon the subject, allow me to transcribe a passage from a northern periodical, entitled, "*The Christian Freeman*," which notices another defect in our committees: "A great number of the Donothing family have been nominated on committees. They were always respectable, both male and female, and therefore very likely to be put on committees, as it is frequently in proportion to a man's noise or his purse, that he stands a chance of being put even on religious committees. Even when appointed on committees, the Donothings take care to maintain their consistency. Their most common plan to escape duty is to absent themselves; this, however, is vulgar. If they can obtain any honourable sinecure post that will keep them above drudgery, well; if not, they know another trick, which is simply to watch their opportunity when any piece of hard work is to be done, and move that Mr. Such-a-one and Mr. Such-another—one an honest hard-working fellow, the other, perhaps, a vain, shallow fellow, shall be appointed to execute it. All the Donothings, of which there is a goodly number in almost every committee, catch the

proposal in an instant; every one is glad that the burden has not fallen on his shoulders; the motion is put, and passed *nem. con.*; and thus old Greybeard Donothing, and all the younger branches, preserve their honour and their name untarnished."

With an anxious desire to be useful, I have ventured to find fault, and I trust that "*verbum sapienti*" will have its due weight with all whom it may concern.

"WATCH AND PRAY."

ON THE MERCY OF GOD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—Wherever the light of Scripture has not shone, most erroneous ideas concerning the nature and attributes of the Supreme Being necessarily exist. This is observed, not only amongst heathen nations, who worship a god of their own imagination, but also amongst ourselves, wherever the Scriptures of truth are not understood.

Of all the errors, though, that prevail amongst us, concerning the nature and attributes of our God, the most general, and perhaps the most awful, is that concerning His MERCY. Men speak of the mercy of God in a manner that reflects dishonour on His *Holy* name—as if *He* were a God that would think light of, or overlook sin.

Men frequently say, We are sinful; but then, we are weak, and God is compassionate, and merciful; *therefore*, such creatures as we are, need not fear his wrath, but may expect his pity and compassion. That our God is pitiful and compassionate, is a great and glorious truth. This application and view of it, though, is most delusive, and most fatal. If this idea were correct, how is it that the world was destroyed in the days of Noah, or Sodom and Gomorrah in the days of Lot? Above all, how is it that *any* of Adam's race will be punished with that "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," mentioned 2 Thessalonians, i. 9?

I was led to consider this subject, some time since, from reading that instructive chapter, the 18th of Luke's Gospel, in which chapter, as given in our English Bibles, the word *mercy* occurs twice; first, in the prayer of the publican, verse 13, "God be merciful to me a sinner;" and afterwards, verse 38, in the cry of blind Bartimeus, "Thou Son of David have mercy on me." We read that the one went down to his house *justified*, and that the other *received his sight*. I could not look on the two cases as being alike, notwithstanding the seeming similarity of the appeal to *mercy*. The latter was an appeal to that compassion

which was manifested by our Emanuel, towards the bodily infirmities of men, shewing forth his power and character, and typifying greater and more enduring blessings. The former, though, was the cry of a sinner to God for the pardon of his sins, which was answered by his going down to his house *justified*. Now, on referring to the passages in the original, I not only found that the language of their prayers was different, but that also much instruction is conveyed by the word used in the prayer of the publican, on the all-important subject of the sinner's approach to God. The word used in the cry of Bartimeus was *ἐλεησον*, which may be considered as an appeal to that feeling which is known to men, which may exist in the breast of one man towards another, and which is properly called pity. The word, though, in the prayer of the publican, was *ἰλασθητι*; an expression that contains in it a direct allusion to the כפרת of the Old Testament—the mercy-seat, (see Exodus 25th chapter, 17th and 22nd verses,) of which it is written, “There I will meet with thee.” This word כפרת is translated by the Seventy, *ἰλαστηριον*; which word was thence transferred into the New Testament, (Hebrews, ix. 5.) To this word *ἰλαστηριον*, there are frequent allusions in the New Testament Scriptures. St. John, in his first Epistle, says, “*He* is the propitiation (*ἰλασμος*) for our sins. St. Paul, though, in Romans, 3d chapter 25th verse, expressly declares that the Lord Jesus Christ is the *ἰλαστηριον*; that He is set forth the mercy-seat, to declare the righteousness of God. From these considerations we learn the nature of the prayer of the publican. It was an appeal to God for pardon, through that way which he had appointed for sinners to approach him; and interpreted by the light of the New Testament dispensation, was to this effect, “Save me, O God, for Jesus Christ His sake.”

I know that we can never *separate* pity and compassion from the mercy of God, revealed unto men; yet, if we once lose sight of His holiness and justice, of His truth and righteousness, in connexion with His mercy, and His being at peace with us, our hearts are not right towards Him. The prayer of the publican teaches us, that we are to look for justification through that wondrous plan, by which mercy and truth, righteousness and peace have met each other; by which our God can be “just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.”

Should these observations be deemed suitable to the pages of the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, their insertion will oblige,

Your Constant Reader,

J. P. S.

HANNAH MORE'S LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE.*

A life like that of Hannah More, which extended over the greater part of a century—connecting an age the great characteristics of which are rapidly passing away, with another, and in many respects, a very different order of things—is one of no ordinary interest and importance; especially, considering that her labours and writings exerted a most astonishing and salutary influence upon both the one and the other. The intimate friend of most of those whose names adorn the literature and theology of the last century—their bosom associate when with them, and their loved and honoured correspondent when absent—it is impossible that a well-written record of her life, and a judicious selection from her correspondence, can be other than interesting and instructive: and having, by the good providence of God, had her life extended, so as to be no less intimately connected with the noblest names of the present period, and the plans of benevolence and piety which are its glory—the history and correspondence of her later years affords an admirable opportunity of contrasting the age in which it is our privilege to live, with that which has passed away.

From the period of American independence, and the French revolution, a new era commenced, not only in regard to political affairs, but in regard to literature, manners, and religion. We do not speak of these events as to their influence in these respects, though they had influence, but rather, as marking the date of the commencement of a new and a different state of things; the result of many, various, yet combined influences; and the volumes before us, containing the record of the life and correspondence of this extraordinary and illustrious female, extend far enough to afford a desirable opportunity of comparing the state of Britain, in a literary, moral, and religious point of view, as it existed both before and subsequent to this epoch. "In the twilight of the old, and the dawn of the new era," says her biographer, "Mrs. More accomplished her date here." And he might have added, that in the records of her earthly career, studied in that "twilight," and that "dawn," we have a most accurate portraiture of Britain, in the most interesting points of view in which it can be contemplated by the patriot, the philanthropist, and the Christian.

We are not, however, under the pretext of writing a review of Hannah More's life, about to write an essay on this subject; but, in collecting from these volumes a brief memoir of this admirable woman, embodying the principal events that chequered

* *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More.* By William Roberts, Esq. 4 vols. 8vo. London, 1834.

her long earthly existence—her writings, her labours of Christian benevolence, and such anecdotes of her contemporaries and friends, as may be suitable to our pages, and amuse and instruct our readers—we shall keep this object in view, and leave those who may read to make the contrast for themselves.

Hannah More, born 1745, was the youngest but one, of five daughters of Jacob More, whom reduced circumstances, arising from an unsuccessful lawsuit, made the master of a school, at Stapleton, Gloucestershire. Her mother was the daughter of a substantial farmer, who resided in the neighbourhood. They were both possessed of a vigorous intellect and sound judgment; and to their culture and regulation of their children, much of the credit and success which attended them was deservedly attributed.

The family of the Mores was highly respectable; but, as was the case in many others, at that period, they were of opposite parties—some High Church, and others zealous Nonconformists. Of the mother of Jacob, the grandmother of Hannah, who was of the latter side, the following is recorded:

“She was a pious woman, and used to tell her younger relatives, that they would have known how to value gospel privileges had they lived, like her, in the days of proscription and persecution, when, at midnight, pious worshippers went with stealthy steps through the snow, to hear the words of inspiration delivered by a holy man at her father's house; while her father, with a drawn sword, guarded the entrance from violent or profane intrusion: adding, that they boarded the minister, and kept his horse, for ten pounds per annum.”

* * *

“In aftertimes, my mother has heard the old lady reproach her granddaughter as lightly esteeming the word of God, when they complained of fatigue after walking some distance, in the midst of winter, to their place of worship. She was a staunch Presbyterian, remarkable for the simplicity and integrity of her principles. She always rose at four, even in the winter, after she had reached her eightieth year; and she lived beyond her ninetieth.”

Hannah More gave early marks of the quickness of apprehension, retentiveness of memory, and thirst after knowledge, which characterized her whole life. Between three and four years of age, by listening while her elder sisters were taught, she had learned to read, without the knowledge of her parents; and before her fourth year, she astonished the clergyman of the parish, by the accuracy with which she could repeat the “Church Catechism.”

Her father had lost his books in removing from his native place to Stapleton; but, from the stores of his memory, he furnished his enquiring child with the outline of Greek and Roman history, while sitting on his knee; which he accurately

remembered. Disliking female pedantry, her father, having begun to teach her classics and mathematics, is said soon to have been frightened at his own success.

Hannah More's eldest sister was sent to a French school at Bristol, it being the wish of the parents that the daughters might be qualified to conduct a boarding-school; and on her return home, at the close of each week, she taught her younger sisters what she herself had learned. Thus Hannah acquired the elements of French; which she afterwards spoke with fluency and precision.

At the age of twenty-one, the eldest sister became the principal of a boarding-school in Bristol; and Hannah, not yet twelve, resided with her for the opportunities of education.

Hannah More was, from infancy, liable to debilitating attacks, and an invalid she continued during her life. It is mentioned, as a proof of her interesting talents, when in her sixteenth year, at which period she had gained the esteem of Sheridan, who lectured on elocution, and Newton, the astronomer, by her extraordinary powers:

"A dangerous illness brought her under the care of Dr. Woodward, a physician of eminence at that day, and distinguished by his correct taste. On one of his visits, being led into conversation with his patient, on subjects of literature, he forgot the purpose of his visit in the fascination of her talk; till suddenly recollecting himself, when he was half-way down stairs, he cried out, 'Bless me! I forgot to ask the girl how she was;' and returned to the room, exclaiming, 'How are you to-day, my poor child?'"

It was at this time she published (1762) "*The Search after Happiness*." Then followed "*The Inflexible Captive*;" but we are not about to imitate her biographer, in giving a consecutive history of her publications, and the success they met with. We must generalize and classify. But this is the place for mentioning, that at the age of twenty-two, she received the addresses of a Mr. Turner, a gentleman of respectability and affluence; but after the day for the nuptials had been repeatedly fixed upon, and as often postponed, the affair terminated in the parties remaining single. There is somewhat of mystery resting upon this, and a subsequent affair of the same kind; but the biographer of Hannah More acquits all the parties of blame, and declares she remained on terms of cordial friendship with both gentlemen during the remainder of their lives.

The mode of her introduction to London, and the literary society of the metropolis, which took place soon after, is not clearly stated; but there is something said about the desire to see a "live author"—such as Dr. Johnson, and to witness the performance of one of Shakspeare's characters by Garrick. The biographer offers the following apology:

"Garrick's career was supposed to be drawing to a close, which inflamed

her eager desire to hear Shakspeare speaking by the organ of that consummate actor—a wish that might be pardoned in one to whom the muse had already made a tender of her patronage, and vouchsafed her inspiration; and for whose brows she was preparing an unfading chaplet.

“What her opinions were, at a subsequent period, of the lawfulness of frequenting theatrical exhibitions, became apparent in her conduct and correspondence; but at the time we are regarding her, neither the manners and habits of persons denominated religious, nor the scruples of her own mind, had interdicted her visits to the theatre.”

Now, we do not like this, nor do we admit it. Religion, its principles, and requirements, are immutable; they belong to all ages and periods; and we should much rather have had stated—which we presume is, after all, the case—that until a long period after this, her heart was devoid of the living principle, the “Divine nature,” however amiable, correct, and moral, she unquestionably was; that she wanted that *spiritual taste for spiritual things*, which is incompatible with delight in the associates, and scenes, and enjoyments in which now she appears to have found her pleasure. The way in which her biographer speaks of this part of her life, and her letters which pass without comment, are calculated to bewilder and mislead; and therefore, we feel compelled to lift up our warning voice.

We shall pass over a good deal of this period of Hannah More's life; though there are scraps and fragments of the literary history of not a few of the giants of that age, which, to literary gleaners, will be interesting—such as Johnson, Reynolds, Burke, Perry, Mrs. Montague, Mrs. Carter, Mrs. Chapone; nor these merely, but Mr. Pitt, Mr. Gibbon, Soame Jermyns, and such like—merely observing, that it was upon a second visit to London, in 1776, she published, “Sir Eldred of the Bower,” and “The Bleeding Rock,” which were very popular, and gained her much notoriety, (we have not read them,) and thus may have opened the way for her subsequent works of a higher order, and a nobler kind, into circles whence, otherwise, they might have been excluded. But we may insert the following record of fashion, in 1776:

“London, 1776.

“Again I am annoyed by the foolish absurdity of the present mode of dress. Some ladies carry on their heads a large quantity of fruit, and yet they would despise a poor useful member of society, who carried it there for the purpose of selling it for bread. Some, at the back of their perpendicular caps, hang four or five ostrich feathers, of different colours, &c. Spirit of Addison! thou pure and gentle shade, arise! thou who, with such fine humour, and such polished sarcasm, didst lash the cherry-coloured hood, and the party patches; and cut down, with a trenchant sickle, a whole harvest of follies and absurdities! awake! for the follies thou didst lash were but the beginning of follies; and the absurdities thou didst cen-

sure, were but the seeds of absurdities! Oh, that thy master-spirit; speaking and chiding in thy graceful page, could recall the blushes, and collect the scattered and mutilated remnants of female modesty!"

The subject of this memoir returned to Bristol, after six months in the metropolis; her "native simplicity," says her biographer, "unsullied by contact" with all she had met there; and, after a tour through Norfolk, of which she gives an account to her London friends, followed her "Percy," a tragedy, which though what is called *successful*—played to *brilliant, overflowing houses*, &c., we have not read; nor here have we expressed, either in her letters written at the time, nor in those of her correspondents, though among them were some high in the church, nor from her biographer, one syllable of doubt or disapprobation; though to the veriest tittle of what is said in its praise, and to the last farthing of the *net proceeds*, all is recorded. Surely had Hannah More written her own life, in her mature years, or had this record been submitted to her, ere she took her flight from earth and time, this would not have been the case; and are we not, then, warranted in protesting against the putting forth a book, as the life of Hannah More, scores of pages of which are filled with what is calculated to leave a false impression on the unsuspecting reader?

It would, however, be the extreme of injustice to the memory of this extraordinary woman, were the impression to be left on the reader's mind, that her whole time was spent either in writing or in hearing plays, or frequenting those scenes of fashionable dissipation with which the metropolis abounded. She read much of theology and general literature; associated with men whose names adorn the pages of English literary and theological history; and it is no slight proof that her powers were extraordinary, and her acquirements varied and extensive, that she was a favourite with such men as Dr. Kennicott, Bishop Porteous, and Dr. Horne.

What we complain of is, that with the occasional recognition of *Christianity in general*, the blessedness it imparts, and the consolations which, in affliction, it affords, there is the utter absence of all that can claim the name of *spirituality of mind*—absolutely no allusion to "a life of faith on the Son of God;" and the plaudits of good sermons and good preachers, of her own circle, are wofully blended with the plaudits of good plays, and of Garrick's and Mrs. Siddons' exquisite performances. *Could* she have been the subject of the "New Creation?" How low, at that time, must have been the standard of genuine Christianity, and the tone of spiritual feeling, even in those branded as Methodists—and she was one! Indeed, with all that some would persuade us, who love to think that, in a religious point of view, all is becoming worse and worse—apostacy growing hourly, and scarcely a vestige of genuine godliness likely to be found by and by—few,

if any of these quondam Methodists, would now be recognized as consistent Christians. Yet she says, in 1783 :

"A visitor is just gone, quite chagrined that I am such a rigid Methodist, that I cannot come to her assembly on Sunday, though she protests with great piety, that she *never has cards*, and that it is quite savage in me to think there can be any harm in a little agreeable music."

During her residence with her sisters, in Bristol, in the summer of 1784, "an extraordinary object was presented," says her biographer, "to the benevolence of the family." This was a milk-woman of unusual talents, who, with her husband and children, was found absolutely starving. On being visited, she produced scraps of poetry, which seemed to the benevolent mind of Hannah More to indicate considerable genius; and the idea occurred that she might, by means of her opulent and elevated friends, make this poor woman's talents the means of placing herself and family in circumstances of comfort. She immediately set about teaching her (for she was quite uneducated) to spell, write, and compose; and while her pupil was preparing a collection of her poems, she was engaged in interesting all her friends of rank, fortune, and influence, in getting subscriptions. Upwards of £600 were procured, and vested in the funds, under the trusteeship of Mrs. Montague and Hannah More; and some idea of her zeal and labour—zeal and labour lost, as it turned out in the end—may be formed from her own declaration, that for thirteen months her time and exertions were chiefly devoted to this work, and in transcribing and correcting the poetry, and writing letters, she wrote more than a thousand pages.

The result will possibly be anticipated by the reader. The protegee became vain; could not brook being exhibited as an object of charity; was furious, because the sum subscribed was not put into her own hands; and circulated the most malicious and unfounded reports of her patroness—as that she intended to appropriate the money to her own use; that she was jealous of her talents, and so forth. It was the age of patronage, of astonishing the public with unlettered intellectual prodigies; and Hannah More—giving her credit for humanity and benevolence—seems not to have been quite free from the infection, in her well-meant, but injudicious plans of providing for her "*Lactissa*," as she called her, that is, *Anglicé*, the "*Milkwoman*." A tenth part of the exertion, and a twentieth part of the sum raised, might have made her and family industrious, respectable, and comfortable, in the sphere that Providence had allotted them; and, instead of grief and disappointment, delight at seeing smiling faces, the index of contentment and gratitude, might have been Hannah's reward. However, her generosity was not overcome. In spite of calumny and ingratitude, she determined to do all she could for the husband and children; and was afterwards enabled to serve them.

It has been mentioned that among the great men with whom

Hannah More was intimate Dr. Johnson was one. It is well known that, however powerfully this wonderful man wrote in favour of religion and morality, his views of the Gospel were sadly dark, and the consequence was, that a tinge of superstition gave a sombre hue to most of his writings, conversations, and devotional exercises. It is gratifying to know, that at last he came to rest simply upon Christ and him crucified; and that he had peace and joy in believing. Our readers will, no doubt, thank us for the following accounts of the closing scenes in the life of this extraordinary man:

“ Hampton, December, 1784.

“ Poor dear Johnson! he is past all hope. The dropsy has brought him to the point of death; his legs are scarified: but nothing will do. I have, however, the comfort to hear that his dread of dying is in a great measure subdued; and now he says, ‘the bitterness of death is past.’ He sent the other day for Sir Joshua; and, after much serious conversation, told him he had three favours to beg of him, and he hoped he would not refuse a dying friend, be they what they would. Sir Joshua promised. The first was, that he would never paint on a Sunday; the second that he would forgive him thirty pounds that he had lent him, as he wanted to leave them to a distressed family; the third was, that he would read the Bible whenever he had an opportunity; and that he would never omit it on a Sunday. There was no difficulty but upon the *first* point; but at length Sir Joshua promised to gratify him in all. How delighted should I be to hear the dying discourse of this great and good man, especially now that faith has subdued his fears. I wish I could see him.

“ As the very interesting particulars contained in the following letter found among Mrs. H. More’s papers, may not be generally known, we shall, perhaps, be excused for interrupting the series of her letters by its insertion.

“ MY DEAR FRIEND,

“ I ought to apologize for delaying so long to gratify your wishes, and fulfil my promise, by committing to paper a conversation which I had with the late Rev. Mr. Storry, of Colchester, respecting Dr. Johnson. I will now, however, proceed at once to record, to the best of my recollection, the substance of our discourse.

“ We were riding together near Colchester, when I asked Mr. Storry whether he had ever heard that Dr. Johnson expressed great dissatisfaction with himself on the approach of death, and that in reply to friends, who, in order to comfort him spoke of his writings in defence of virtue and religion, he had said, ‘admitting all you urge to be true, how can I tell when I have done enough?’

“ Mr. S. assured me that what I had just mentioned was perfectly correct, and then added the following interesting particulars.

“ Dr. Johnson, said he, did feel as you describe, and was not to be comforted by the ordinary topics of consolation which were addressed to him.

In consequence, he desired to see a clergyman, and particularly described the views and character of the person whom he wished to consult. After some consideration a Mr. Winstanley was named, and the Doctor requested Sir John Hawkins to write a note in his name, requesting Mr. W.'s attendance as a minister.

"Mr. W., who was in a very weak state of health, was quite overpowered on receiving the note, and felt appalled by the very thought of encountering the talents and learning of Dr. Johnson. In his embarrassment he went to his friend Colonel Pownall, and told him what had happened, asking, at the same time, for his advice how to act. The Colonel, who was a pious man, urged him immediately to follow what appeared to be a remarkable leading of Providence, and, for the time, argued his friend out of his nervous apprehension: but after he had left Colonel Pownall, Mr. W.'s fears returned in so great a degree as to prevail upon him to abandon the thought of a personal interview with the Doctor. He determined, in consequence, to write him a letter: that letter, I think, Mr. Storey said he had seen—at least a copy of it—and part of it he repeated to me as follows:

"SIR—I beg to acknowledge the honour of your note, and am very sorry that the state of my health prevents my compliance with your request: but my nerves are so shattered that I feel as if I should be quite confounded by your presence, and instead of promoting, should only injure the cause in which you desire my aid. Permit me, therefore, to write what I should wish to say were I present. I can easily conceive what would be the subjects of your inquiry. I can conceive that the views of yourself have changed with your condition, and that on the near approach of death, what you once considered mere peccadilloes have risen into mountains of guilt, while your best actions have dwindled into nothing. On whichever side you look you see only positive transgressions or defective obedience; and hence, in self-despair, are eagerly inquiring, 'What shall I do to be saved?' I say to you, in the language of the Baptist, 'Behold the Lamb of God!' &c. &c.

"When Sir John Hawkins came to this part of Mr. W.'s letter, the Doctor interrupted him, anxiously asking, '*does he say so?* Read it again! Sir John.' Sir John complied: upon which the Doctor said, 'I must see that man; write again to him.' A second note was accordingly sent: but even this repeated solicitation could not prevail over Mr. Winstanley's fears. He was led, however, by it to write again to the Doctor, renewing and enlarging upon the subject of his first letter; and these communications, together with the conversation of the late Mr. Latrobe, who was a particular friend of Dr. Johnson, appear to have been blessed by God in bringing this great man to the renunciation of self, and a simple reliance on Jesus as his Saviour, thus also communicating to him that peace which he had found the world could not give, and which, when the world was fading from his view, was to fill the void, and dissipate the gloom, even of the valley of the shadow of death.

"I cannot conclude without remarking what honour God has hereby put

upon the doctrine of faith in a crucified Saviour. The man whose intellectual powers had awed all around him, was, in his turn, made to tremble, when the period arrived at which all knowledge is useless, and vanishes away, except the knowledge of the true God, and of Jesus Christ, whom he has sent. Effectually to attain this knowledge, this giant in literature must become a little child. The man looked up to as a prodigy of wisdom, must become a fool that he might be wise.

"What a comment is this upon that word, 'The loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be laid low, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day.'"

"Mr. Pepys wrote me a very kind letter on the death of Johnson, thinking I should be impatient to hear something relating to his last hours. Dr. Brocklesby, his physician, was with him; he said to him a little before he died, Doctor, you are a worthy man, and my friend, but I am afraid you are not a Christian! what can I do better for you than offer up, in your presence, a prayer to the great God, that you may become a Christian in my sense of the word. Instantly he fell on his knees, and put up a fervent prayer; when he got up he caught hold of his hand with great earnestness, and cried, Doctor, you do not say Amen. The Doctor looked foolishly, but after a pause, cried, Amen! Johnson said, My dear doctor, believe a dying man, there is no salvation but in the sacrifice of the Lamb of God; go home, write down my prayer, and every word I have said, and bring it me to-morrow. Brocklesby did so.

"A friend desired he would make his will, and as Hume, in his last moments, had made an impious declaration of his opinions, he thought it would tend to counteract the poison, if Johnson would make a public confession of his faith in his will. He said he would; seized the pen with great earnestness, and asked what was the usual form of beginning a will? His friend told him. After the usual forms he wrote, 'I offer up my soul to the great and merciful God; I offer it full of pollution, but in full assurance that it will be cleansed in the blood of my Redeemer.' And for some time he wrote on with the same vigour and spirit as if he had been in perfect health. When he expressed some of his former dread of dying, Sir John said, If you, doctor, have these fears, what is to become of me and others? Oh! Sir, said he, I have *written* piously, it is true; but I have *lived* too much like other men. It was a consolation to him, however, in his last hours, that he had never written in derogation of religion or virtue. He talked of his death and funeral at times with great composure. On the Monday morning, he fell into a sound sleep, and continued in that state for twelve hours, and then died without a groan.

"No action of his life became him like the leaving it. His death makes a kind of era in literature; piety and goodness will not easily find a more able defender, and it is delightful to see him set, as it were, his dying seal to the professions of his life, and to the truth of Christianity.

"I now recollect with melancholy pleasure, two little anecdotes of this

departed genius, indicating a zeal for religion which one cannot but admire, however characteristically rough. When the Abbé Raynal was introduced to him, upon the Abbé's advancing to take his hand, Doctor J. drew back and put his hands behind him, and afterwards replied to the expostulation of a friend, Sir, I will not shake hands with an infidel! At another time, I remember asking him if he did not think the Dean of Derry a very agreeable man, to which he made no answer, and on repeating my question, Child, said he, I will not speak anything in favour of a Sabbath-breaker, to please you, nor anyone else."

But the course of events in the life of Hannah More, now conducts us to the period when her character assumed a more decidedly religious aspect; when the emptiness of all which literature, and social enjoyment, and fame can bestow was felt; when the utter incompatibility of such a life as she had heretofore lived, with devotedness to the Redeemer, and his claims, was seen; when "not your own, but bought with a price; *therefore*, glorify God in your body, and with your spirit, which are God's," came with all its power upon her mind; and she determined to abandon all enjoyments "which are not in accordance with Scripture, and in unison with prayer:"

"And while many of her friends and companions remained contented where she found them, till their places knew them no more, Hannah More was advancing in religious attainments, and listening to the vocation that summoned her to solid glory. Prayer, the frequent perusal of holy scripture, and the strict observance of the Sabbath, kept her mind in a healthful state, and her feet in 'the walk of wisdom.'"

Hannah More had become possessor of "Cowslip Green," (near Bristol,) a secluded spot: here, with her sisters, and select friends, many of her happiest and most blissful hours were spent: her leisure moments were employed in gardening; and, as her health permitted, her other hours in reading. Still her periodical visits to London were continued. We extract, from one of her letters, her account of an interview with a Turkish ambassador: the date is May 10, 1787:

"I have always had a great curiosity to converse with a disciple of Mahomet, and it was gratified the other day by my being invited to meet the Turkish ambassador. His suite, I think, consisted of six Musselmans. They took their coffee sitting cross-legged on the floor. I confined my attention entirely to his excellency, who was placed next to me on the sofa, and did not sit cross-legged. His dragoman is a very sensible, agreeable person, and speaks all languages. The ambassador, a good solemn-looking Turk, was very communicative; his son stood the whole evening behind the sofa on which his father sat. I obtained considerable information about their usages and manners. At my desire, they spoke together a little Arabic, which is a very pretty-sounding language. They had, I believe, some hopes of bringing me over to the faith of the prophet, for they recom-

mended me to read Sale's edition of the Alcoran. In return, I think I should have advised them to read White's Sermons. I asked how they contrived to exercise their religion in this country without a mosque. They told me that every great man in their country was both priest and lawyer, and allowed to exercise all the functions of both; that the ambassador did the duties of religion in his own house; and the Turk added, 'I do not know how those (pointing to some statesmen who sat at a distance) lords do, but I am not ashamed to own that I retire five times a-day to offer prayer and oblation.' This he partly explained to me in broken Italian, and the rest was interpreted to me by the secretary."

About this period, her acquaintance with the Rev. John Newton, Rev. R. Cecil, William Wilberforce, and other men of God, holy and beloved, appears to have commenced; and, no doubt, their conversation and correspondence contributed to her growing spirituality. It was now, too, that her writings became possessed of that impress of the Spirit, which secured for thousands and tens of thousands who read them, not ephemeral gratification, but solid, substantial, lasting peace and joy. On her presenting that venerable servant of the Lord, John Newton, with her "Thoughts on the Manners of the Great," he wrote her a letter, from which we extract the following paragraph:

"It is a singular privilege to have a *consecrated* pen, and to be able and willing to devote our talents to the cause of God and religion. There are no persons whom I more compassionate, or of whom I am more afraid, than some of those whom you so well describe, under the character of good sort of people. I am often reminded of a hard-named figure, called, I think, an antiperistasis, the force of which is well illustrated, when we say the fire burns most fiercely in frosty weather. If I am lawfully called into the company of the profligate, I am too much shocked to be in great danger of being hurt by them. I feel myself in the situation of the traveller, when assaulted by the north-wind. The vehemence of the wind makes me wrap my cloak the faster about me. But when I am with your good sort of people, I am like the same traveller when under the powerful beams of the sun; the insinuating warmth puts me insensibly off my guard, and I am in danger of voluntarily dropping the cloak, which could not be forced from me by downright violence. The circle of politeness, elegance, and taste, unless a higher spirit and principle predominate, is to me an enchanted spot, which I seldom enter without fear, and seldom retire from without loss."

The work, to which this paragraph refers, produced an astonishing sensation in the public mind; it went through numerous editions in an unusually brief period; and may be considered, *on the one hand, as her testimony* (and well was she qualified to give it) against the prevalent disregard of religion in the upper circles, which then abounded, while they affected to mourn over the growth of infidelity in the lower; and *on the other, as God's testimony* to her fidelity, in denouncing what she believed wrong, though in her own devotedly attached circle.

Her biographer continues :

" It is impossible duly to appreciate the value of the effort she made in publishing her work on 'The Manners of the Great,' without considering that these were not the animadversions of a recluse, but of one who was flattered, admired, and courted, by the very people whose vices and follies she was about to reprove; and these, too, persons whom she was in the daily habit of meeting, and whose attentions were supposed to confer distinction. Nor let it be forgotten that this publication was not the product of a censorious temper, but of a heart and understanding nobly engaged in the cause of God, and of the soul. She could not be ignorant that this step might probably exclude her from those circles in which she had hitherto been so conspicuous and so caressed; but the happiness of her friends was dearer to her than their favour. Thus was a new era begun in the literary life of our author. She now began to dedicate her powerful talents to the more immediate service of God, and the benefit of his creatures, and made her first direct advance in the walk of a Christian moralist,—that walk in which she afterward proceeded, with her mind stayed upon Him who holdeth up the goings of his people in the way of his commandments."

This work was followed by "An Estimate of the Religion of the Fashionable World;" the influence of which in detecting abuses, exposing corruptions, and exhibiting the lack of religion in the education of the upper classes, was great and salutary.

The following extract from a letter to her sister, at this period, will be interesting, as it refers to that truly great and good man, GEORGE THE THIRD, during his melancholy illness, 1789. Dr. Willis, his medical attendant, is the person referred to :

" He never saw, he said, so much natural sweetness and goodness of mind, united to so much piety, as in the king. During his illness he many times shed tears for Lord North's blindness. The Bishop of London had been to the king that morning; he was in a very devout frame of mind, which his enemies will say is the surest sign he is still deranged. He told the bishop, 'that at the worst, his trust in God had never forsaken him; that *that* confidence alone had been his support.' He added, 'that he wished to return his thanks to Almighty God, in the most public manner, and hoped the bishop would not refuse him a sermon.' He proposed going to St. Paul's to do it. It was a grand idea, and I think it will be one of the most awful scenes since the opening of Solomon's Temple; but they dissuade him very much from it; thinking that the concourse and joy of the people would be too much for his feelings. He himself has named one of the Psalms for the thanksgiving day, and the xiith of Isaiah for the lesson."

It is to the same event that the following extract of a letter from John Newton refers; and in it the spirit, no less than the hand, of that holy man will be traced:

" I hope you received my printed sermon. I sent it to the Adelphi, but heard afterwards that you had left London before I was aware. The importance, the critical season, and the suddenness of the king's recovery, offered an occasion almost sufficient to make, as we say, the stones speak. I

could not be silent. I preached three sermons on the event, and printed the last a month after the thanksgiving-day on which it was preached; some reasons induced me to publish it—though at the time I had no intention to do so; and therefore, not having written a syllable, I was obliged to apply to my recollection for the substance of what I had delivered. The hand and providence of God was generally acknowledged, and some confessions of this kind extorted even from infidels; but I was willing to lead the thoughts of my hearers and readers to Him with whom we expressly have to do; to the God who manifests his glory in the person of Jesus Christ, by whom he exercises all power and authority in heaven and earth. This truth, that individuals, and families, and nations, and things, are under the administration of Him, who his ownself bare our sins in his own body upon the tree, is the very life of my soul, the foundation of my hopes, and of all that deserves the name of religion; without it, all appears to me dead, uncomfortable, and unfruitful. No scheme of religion can afford me relief, but that which is accommodated to the state of the unworthy helpless sinner, who needs multiplied forgiveness, and continual supplies; having nothing of his own, but evil and misery.

“ Oh! had it been left to me, when I first perceived my wretchedness, to devise a way of escape, and to consider how He on whom I could venture to trust must be qualified, in order to be able to save me to the uttermost, I must have been utterly and for ever at a loss. But blessed be God, I found the great desideratum settled and provided for me to my hand; and that Jesus, as revealed in the Gospel, was exactly the very Saviour I would have wished for, had I known how. My case required great compassion, that could pity the most obstinate and rebellious; great power, to subdue the most inveterate habits of wickedness, and to protect me from dangers which I could neither foresee nor prevent, and from legions of enemies, with whom I was quite unable to cope. It required likewise some very valuable and important considerations to satisfy me how it could be consistent with the justice and holiness of God, to afford mercy to such a wretch as I. But in what the Scripture teaches of the person, the offices, the love, the sufferings of the Son of God, I have found enough to silence every doubt, to obviate every difficulty, to banish every fear. So that if my faith and actual experience were but equal to the views my judgment has formed upon these points, I should be the happiest creature alive; and should go on singing with the apostle to the end of my days, and even in the midst of tribulation, “ If God be for us, who can be against us? It is Christ that died; yea, rather that is risen, ascended, and is making intercession for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?”

“ But alas, Madam, too often my judgment and my experience differ almost as much as the knowledge we obtain of a country by looking on a map, differs from that which is acquired by travelling through it. Though the Lord has in mercy opened my eyes, I cannot see without light, and this light is not in myself. I depend upon an agency which I cannot command, but which I can, and do, too often grieve. In proportion as this influence is suspended or diminished, I revert again into my original self, and all my

supposed knowledge is as useless as the figures and gnomon of a dial when the sun no longer shines. To this it is owing, that I am such a riddle to myself, such a medley of inconsistencies and contradictions, that I would and would not; that I can and cannot; that I do what I hate, and neglect what I desire; that it has so often been a point of deliberation with me, whether I should please God or man; that I can so glibly write before breakfast, of my obligations to the Saviour, and yet possibly before dinner, feel myself in such a situation as to be almost ashamed of owning my attachment to him.

Oh! if the world, with all its blandishments, or with all its scorning, was to come upon me sometimes, I think I should know how to give it an answer. But there are seasons when I find myself a very coward, and then, if I were not secretly upheld by Him, from whose cause I am basely shrinking, I should actually throw down my arms and quit the field.

"Well, I hope it will not always be so. Indeed I do not expect any reason to think better of myself, while I am here. My mortal frame, like the leprous house, is so deeply infected that it is incurable; the timber and the stone must be taken down. I hope I wish to live as becometh a saint, but after all, I must be content and thankful to die as becometh a sinner, crying for mercy, and only looking for it on account of Him whom I have pierced. But there is another and a better state, when I hope to be all eye, all ear, all heart towards Him who loved me, and gave himself for me. Then may we meet and behold his glory, and praise Him for ever."

It was at the close of 1789, that Hannah More, with her four sisters—who had, she by her pen, and they by their school—realized a competency, determined to retire, and devote their remaining days to quiet, between Bath where they had built a house, and Cowslip-green their rural residence; but Divine Providence opened the way for a series of labours, more arduous, and, probably, not less useful than any in which they had been engaged. In their excursions around Bristol, they were astonished and grieved at the ignorance, depravity, and irreligion of the villagers in the vicinity. A school was opened at a village called Cheddar; which soon included three hundred children. But prejudice against educating the poor, then prevailed:

"Many of the opulent farmers patriotically opposed the innovation; one of them observing, that the country in which the ladies were introducing this disturbance had never prospered since religion had been brought into it by the monks of Glastonbury."

In a letter to Wilberforce, the deplorable state of things at that period is graphically sketched: we copy it for the instruction of the *'laudatores temporis acti'*:

George Hotel, Cheddar, 1789.

"DEAR SIR,—Though this is but a *romantic place*, as my friend Matthew well observed, yet you would laugh to see the bustle I am in. I was told we should meet with great opposition, if I did not try to propitiate the chief

despot of the village, who is very rich, and very brutal ; so I ventured to the den of this monster, in a country as savage as himself, near Bridgwater. He begged I would not think of bringing any religion into the country ; it was the worst thing in the world for the poor, for it made them lazy and useless. In vain I represented to him that they would be more industrious as they were better principled ; and that, for my own part, I had no selfish views in what I was doing. He gave me to understand that he knew the world too well to believe either the one or the other. Somewhat dismayed to find that my success bore no proportion to my submissions, I was almost discouraged from more visits ; but I found that friends must be secured at all events, for if these rich savages set their faces against us, and influenced the poor people, I saw that nothing but hostilities would ensue ; so I made eleven more of these agreeable visits ; and as I improved in the art of canvassing, had better success. Miss Wilberforce would have been shocked, had she seen the petty tyrants whose insolence I stroked and tamed, the ugly children I praised, the pointers and spaniels I caressed, the cider I commended, and the wine I swallowed. After these irresistible flatteries, I inquired of each if he could recommend me to a house ; and said that I had a little plan which I hoped would secure their orchards from being robbed, their rabbits from being shot, their game from being stolen, and which might lower the poor-rates. If effect be the best proof of eloquence, then mine was a good speech, for I gained at length the hearty concurrence of the whole people, and their promise to discourage or favour the poor in proportion as they were attentive or negligent in sending their children. Patty, who is with me, says she has good hope that the hearts of some of these rich poor wretches may be touched : they are as ignorant as the beasts that perish, intoxicated every day before dinner, and plunged in such vices as make me begin to think London a virtuous place. By their assistance, I procured immediately a good house, which, when a partition is taken down, and a window added, will receive a great number of children. The house, and an excellent garden of almost an acre of ground, I have taken at once for six guineas and a half per year. I have ventured to take it for *seven years*—there is courage for you ! It is to be put in order *immediately* ; ‘for the night cometh :’ and it is a comfort to think, that though I may be dust and ashes in a few weeks, yet by that time this business will be in actual motion. I have written to different manufacturing towns for a mistress, but can get nothing hitherto. As to the mistress for the *Sunday* school, and the religious part, I have employed Mrs. Easterbrook, of whose judgment I have a good opinion. I hope Miss W. will not be frightened, but I am afraid she must be called a Methodist.”

Success at Cheddar emboldened efforts in other villages ; and, in one letter she says :

“ I have been ferreting about these two months among the neglected villages of this hardly Christian country, to find out those places which are particularly destitute of religious advantages ; and have fixed on the central parish of six large ones, which have not so much as a resident *curate*, for the

principal scene of my operations. I have hired an old vicarage house, which has had no inhabitant these hundred years; and in this I propose to place some pious and knowing people to instruct the poor, who are more vicious and ignorant than I could have conceived possible in a country which calls itself Christian. The vicar, who lives a long way off, is repairing the house for me, and as he is but ninety-four years old, he insists on my taking a lease, and is as rigorous about the rent as if I were taking it for an assembly room. It will take some time to put this in order, but next Sunday we are to open a smaller school, a sort of detachment from these head-quarters; and as all these villages are from six to ten miles distance from me, you will believe I am not a little engaged. I am not apt to be very sanguine in my expectations; but I comfort myself by remembering that we have nothing to do with *events*: and, indeed, the uncommon prosperity we have at Cheddar ought to encourage us: we have a great number there who could only tell their letters when we began, and can already read the Testament, and not only say the Catechism, but give pertinent answers to any questions which involve the first principles of Christianity; but then the ability and piety of the teachers we have there, surpass what we can expect to find again. I should not enlarge on these little circumstances so much to any body else; but I know you like these Goody-two-shoe details; besides, if there were any merit (I hate the Popish word) in these little schemes, it is not mine; for I have little money, and if I had much, I should, too probably, spend it as those who have a great deal commonly do. I know myself too well to blame others much."

In another letter—and we print all this for the information and encouragement of our friends in this country—she says:

"We have in this neighbourhood thirteen adjoining parishes, without so much as even a resident curate. I am deeply convinced how very poor and inadequate any miserable attempts of mine can be, to rectify so wide-spread an evil; yet I could not be comfortable till something was attempted. We have, therefore, established schools and various little institutions, over a tract of country of ten or twelve miles, and have near five hundred children in training. As the land is almost pagan, we bring down persons of great reputation for piety from other places, and the improvements are great for the time. But how we shall be able to keep up these things, with so much opposition, vice, poverty, and ignorance, as we have to deal with, I cannot guess."

"While we are sending missionaries to India, our own villages are in pagan darkness, and upon many of them scarcely a ray of Christianity has shone. I speak from the most minute and diligent examination. I have been constantly occupied this whole summer in trying what my poor abilities, and my small influence over others, richer and better, can bring about. In one particular spot, for instance, there are six large parishes, without so much as a resident curate. Three commonly-gifted curates cannot serve eight churches. Through the kind assistance of a friend or two, I am endeavouring

to fix schools and other little institutions, in the most destitute of these places, and as they are from six to ten miles distant, you will judge that it employs a good deal of my time. I have the satisfaction to tell you, that Cheddar, our first establishment, goes on most prosperously. We have a great many children in that parish only, and by the ability and piety of our teachers, their improvement surpasses my warmest hopes."

By and by benevolence expanded her plans; the people were taught industry; comfort and quiet followed; profligates were reclaimed; religious services for adults, as well as the young, were set on foot; till the magistrates became astonished at the change produced in habits and morals, and were anxious to know how it was brought about.

"On Sunday," says she to Mr. Wilberforce, "we opened the school. It was an affecting sight. Several of the grown-up youths had been tried at the last assizes; three were the children of a person lately condemned to be hanged;—many thieves! all ignorant, profane, and vicious beyond belief! Of this banditti we have enlisted one hundred and seventy; and when the clergyman, a hard man, who is also the magistrate, saw these creatures kneeling round us, whom he had seldom seen, but to commit or to punish in some way, he burst into tears. I can do them little good, I fear, but the grace of God can do all. Your friend, Henry T——, thought we ought to try.

We shall close, for this Number, these accounts with an extract of a letter from John Newton, cheering these devoted ladies in their good work:

"Every Sunday morning, my thoughts set out in quest of you and Miss Patty; and though I know not what road you may have taken, I think I seldom miss finding you. There is a communion in spirit among the believing members of that body of which Jesus is the living head, which I believe is not impeded by local distance. Thus the Apostle speaks of being present with the Colossians, though he had never seen them, chap. ii. 5. The powers of the mind in this respect are wonderful, though little attended to, and perhaps are heightened when we think of those whom we have seen, and whom we know and love. How often, in writing a letter, have I been led, without choice or design, to such subjects as have exactly suited my correspondents, no less so than if I had been upon the spot with them, or had previously known their situation, and even their thoughts. I cannot account for this sympathy, but of the fact I am assured by a thousand instances. And it helps me to understand why such a man as St. Paul was so earnestly solicitous for the prayers of his friends, though doubtless many of them were greatly below him in grace. If, sometimes, when riding over the mountains, you should happen to think of me, it is possible, perhaps probable, that I am thinking of you at the same moment. Depend upon it, I am often near you and with you in the Apostle's sense, and my thoughts are thoughts of prayer, that the Lord may bless and keep you and

your companions, protect your persons, comfort your hearts, and crown your endeavours with growing and abundant success.

"When I think of your turn of mind, what you give up, and to what hardships and fatigues, not to say dangers, you expose yourself, for the instruction of the ignorant, and the relief of the wretched; and especially knowing, as surely I do know, that the Lord whom you serve has given you the grace of humility—so that, far from valuing yourself upon your exertions, you can sit down at his feet ashamed and sorry that you can do no more; I adore and praise him who has put it into your heart, strengthens your hands, and has hitherto prepared your way. I am not often charged with flattery—I mean not to flatter, but to encourage you in the name of the Lord. He has highly honoured you, my dear madam; He has allotted you a post of great importance, and for which, perhaps, no person in the kingdom has equal advantages with yourself. Zeal, perhaps, sufficient to attempt something in the same way might be found in many; but other requisites are wanting. If a prudent minister should attempt such an extensive inroad into the kingdom of darkness, he might expect such opposition as few could withstand. But your sex and your character afford you a peculiar protection. They who would try to trample one of us into the dust, will be ashamed *openly* to oppose you: I say *openly*: I believe you do not expect they will thank you, much less assist you. There are those who will probably show their teeth, if they are not permitted to bite. But you are prepared for consequences; the Lord will be with you, and the blessing promised to those who appear decidedly on the Lord's side, and who are instrumental in turning many to righteousness, will make you rich amends for all that you may meet with, of the unpleasant or unkind. What a world do we live in, that it should require a good degree of resolution and grace to be able to say, I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ! Though the Gospel be the brightest display of the wisdom, love, power, and glory of the great God—though it be the highest object of admiration to all superior intelligences, the greater part of mankind are ashamed of it, yea! despise and hate it to such a degree, that an avowed attachment to it is sufficient to dissolve the strongest and closest ties of friendship, and often to make those of our own household our enemies. Poor mortals! Is it not enough that you reject the authority of God, and trample upon his holy commandments, unless you despise his mercy likewise? But so it is; and such is the awful extent of our depravity. Many are thus disposed, and we also should have been like-minded, if left to ourselves. Where there is a difference, grace has made it; for by nature we are no wiser or better than others. What do we owe to the great Shepherd, who not only died for his sheep, but who seeks them out, while they are heedlessly wandering in the paths that lead to destruction! When He first knocked at the door of our hearts, we (or at least I) attempted to bar and bolt it against Him. Like the man possessed by the legion, I thought he was come to torment me before the time. Could my wretched will have prevailed, He would have departed from me, and left me to perish. But He pitied my madness, and if I see his face with comfort at last, as I trust I shall, I must confess that he saved me, not only in defiance of my enemies, but in

defiance of myself. What shall we render to the Lord for all his mercies! He needeth us not. We can add nothing to His all-sufficiency and glory—yet He leaves us scope for the exercise of our gratitude—He invites us to take Himself for our exemplar, and His merciful conduct towards us as a pattern for us to follow in our behaviour towards our fellow-creatures. To forgive as we have been forgiven: to return good for evil; to overcome evil, if possible, with good; to imitate in our little circles His diffusive benevolence, and thus to walk in His footsteps, will cause the spirit of the world which crucified Him to act more or less against us. But the lions are chained, and the chain is in His hands. They cannot stir without His permission, nor go an inch beyond the bounds he prescribes.

“ Fear not, my dear ladies; all the praying souls upon earth, all the saints in glory, all the angels of the Lord, and the Lord of angels himself, are with you. If the veil were withdrawn, if you could see with the eyes of Elisha’s servant or of Stephen, you would see that there are many more for you than against you. But faith is the evidence of things not seen. I trust you can look up to the Saviour and behold Him as looking down upon you, holding forth the prize in view, and saying, ‘ Fear none of these things’—‘ Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.’ May you fight under this banner, and go forth conquering and to conquer.”

In our next we shall finish this truly interesting Memoir. We could not well have abridged this part more; and the remainder is so truly interesting, that we are anxious to allot it ample scope and verge enough.

REASONS FOR ATTACHMENT AND CONFORMITY
TO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.*

How striking are some of the analogies between the mind and body in their healthy operations; in perception, in improvement by exercise, and in their submission, to a certain extent, to the empire of the will. In their disorders, too, how similar! each may be enfeebled by disease: an undue preponderance of any one organ, or faculty, diminishes the power of others; and both are subject to epidemics. There are mental as well as bodily, spiritual as well as temporal epidemics, which arise, we know not how, continue their course for a certain time, and finally subside. In judgment, God's destroying angel has repeatedly passed over this land; nor has the sword been stayed until multitudes of our fellow-creatures have been called to appear before his bar.

There are times, too, when the spirit of error seems to be let loose, to deceive the church for a while, and perhaps for the trial of our faith. Such a period, we think, is the present. We say nothing of opinions beyond the pale of Christianity, but in the visible church there are two epidemics, which prevail to a considerable extent, viz. the epidemic of prophecy and that of dissent. We shall defer our analysis of the former until a future number, and occupy ourselves at present with some considerations touching the latter, which have arisen in our minds in connexion with the perusal of Mr. Meek's volume. In reviewing this question we should ever bear in mind the distinction between the ordinances, institutions, and doctrines of a church, and the ministers, or officials, by whom she is impersonated. Thus, the church of Rome is anti-scriptural in its constitution, although many of her clergy have been, and doubtless are, children of God. The church of England is undoubtedly a scriptural church, though at different periods much darkness and ignorance have pervaded her functionaries. Now, in the former case, our duty would be, either to reform the church or to leave it. Such was Luther's view and conduct. But in the latter instance we are differently circumstanced; we ought, certainly, to strive and to pray for the enlightening of her ministers, but should we fail, a doubt may still remain how far we are justified in making a schism. However, our God-fearing ancestors thought it right to separate, and we are far from quarrelling with their decision; but we think their descendants lose sight of the above distinction, and its consequent doubt, in their attacks upon

* *Reasons for Attachment and Conformity to the Church of England.*
By the Rev. R. Meek. Second edition.

the church; for if there be the very slightest truth in our proposition, "that the church of England has its foundation in scripture," even admitting the mixture of human imperfection, the doubt comes with irresistible force, now that God has 'renewed his work' in the church; now that her ministers are, in the main, zealous, working, godly men, feeding the flock of Christ with the bread and water of life; "spending and being spent," so that they may win souls to Christ. Now, that one very strong objection to our church is removed, in the sanctification of her ministers, arguments on the other point should, indeed, be cogent and conscientious ere they are permitted to lead to separation between brethren.

At present, then, we think the question stands thus: the doctrines of our church are allowed to be scriptural; some of her ordinances and institutions are so likewise, but others are objected to as *unscriptural*, and some few as *antiscritural*; and her "bishops, priests, and deacons," are a body of men, amongst whom, for some years past, the work of God, by his Spirit, has gone on with power; the number of those who are Christ's "faithful soldiers and servants" increasing daily, and on whose devoted labours God's blessing has evidently descended. This being admitted, the point for consideration is reduced within very narrow limits; and it is this, whether with so many reasons for union—the doubtful points are so weighty and so clear, as to overbalance the others, and to render it our duty to withdraw ourselves?

The question at issue standing thus, we gladly avail ourselves of the work placed at the head of this article; and the more so, as it is the production of one who was, for many years, a dissenting minister, and who, seeing it his duty to enter into union with the church of England, still duly estimates, and is in return appreciated by his excellent dissenting brethren. His book consists of two parts; in the first he defends (throughout it is, as it should be, merely a defence,) the union of church and state; episcopacy; the claims of the church of England; and considers the lawfulness or unlawfulness of separation. In the second he answers some popular objections to the liturgical forms, baptismal and other services, &c. Some of these subjects are, in their nature, such as dissenters have a right to investigate; and others form matters of consideration to those in the church, and which our brethren, as dissenters, have no *right* to impugn, any more than we (in this day of toleration) would attack their internal management. The first question entered upon is, the union of church and state; and as, besides being in the opinions of dissenters, the "*fons et origo mali*," it is the subject upon which their arguments are strongest; it may be of use to examine this point a little in detail. The question is a twofold one, and, though blended in most attacks, ought to be considered separately: first, as to its foundation in right principle; and

secondly, as to the prudential considerations in its favour, or the contrary; in other words, as to its usefulness.

First, then, as to the union of church and state being justifiable on the grounds of right principle; here we have three lines of argument: it is consistent with the natural arrangements of Divine Providence; scripture is not opposed to it; and, it is involved, necessarily, in a correct *idea* of the church. As this latter proposition will be found fully established in Coleridge's "Church and State," we shall for the present defer entering upon it.

Society, in its providential institutions, will be found typical, one part of the other. A unity of organization pervades the whole. Thus, in its simplest form, a family, we find established a government by one head, who, with certain limits, legislates, in temporal and religious matters for the whole; at once the king and priest of his people; upon him rests the responsibility of providing for their bodily and spiritual wants. He cannot, it is true, compel them to worship God, as he may think right; but he would be criminal, did he not provide the opportunity, and exercise a certain restraint over their outward conduct. (*e. g.* Eli and his Sons.) Now, take the union of several families, and see how this agrees with the type. In a natural state of society, this presents a picture of patriarchal government, having one head, upon whom devolve similar duties. Then come in successive provincial governments, and finally the government by one individual, placed over all as king. That in some places his power is limited does not affect the question. It would be very difficult, we think, to show that the two lines of duty typified in the first example, cease at any period and under any state of society (except in a country of godless political economists). But let us hear what Mr. M. says on this question:

"The same reasons which determine what is duty, and therefore lawful, in this smaller community (a family), equally decide as to its being the duty, and therefore lawful, on the part of a king, or the legislature, to provide for and establish the means of religious instruction of the larger community, over the interests of which Providence has called them to preside."

Mr. Meek then quotes a sentence from Dr. Chalmers, and, in the Appendix, one from Grotius, which we shall transcribe also:

"It appears, then, to be a paramount duty to promote Christianity, in some form of it, to the utmost of our power, and that this obligation increases in proportion to the extent of our influence and authority; so far, therefore, are kings from being released from this duty, that they, more than all others, are bound to exert themselves in propagating a religion so essential to the happiness and good order of their subjects. Now, this obligation appears necessarily to lead to the embodying of one religion with the affairs of the state, and to lay all Christian kings under a moral necessity to advance its real interests."

After some close reasoning, Grotius concludes in the words of a reformed church :

“ It belongs to magistrates, not only to be careful of civil polity, but to endeavour that the sacred ministry be preserved, and the kingdom of Christ propagated: that the Gospel be purely preached, and God served according to His holy Word.”

So much for the arguments derived from the order of Providence in human institutions. That this union in itself is not contrary to Scripture can easily be proved. The union of church and state was represented in the person of Melchisedech, and again embodied in the Jewish dispensation; and although we bring not these as a direct authority for the national establishment of religion; yet we may surely draw the inference, that had the principle of such an establishment been unlawful, we should scarcely find the example in the government of God's own peculiar people, for whom He specially legislated. These instances are deserving of grave consideration. As to the force of the Saviour's declaration, “ My kingdom is not of this world,” we shall allow Mr. Meek to speak for himself:

“ The declaration of Christ, ‘ My kingdom is not of this world,’ has been considered as furnishing an unanswerable objection against a legislative establishment and alliance of his religion with the state. Those who venture on such an inference from this declaration of our blessed Lord, overlook the reason and design of Christ in making it. The Jews well knew that the Roman governor could not take cognizance of a mere *religious* dispute: they therefore charge Christ with the design of setting up an authority and kingdom against *Cæsar*: this was the matter of their *accusation*. Pilate, therefore, puts the direct question to Christ—‘ Art thou a king?’—demanding of him, by such an inquiry, whether he claimed to exercise authority as an independent ruler. Our Lord, therefore, replied, ‘ My kingdom is not of this world.’ Christ, in effect, said, ‘ I am indeed a king, but not in the sense in which you understand it, and in which I am accused. I aim at no earthly throne, or political sceptre; I am no rival of *Cæsar*. My kingdom is not of this world, but in heaven; and the reign I seek is in the hearts of mankind.’ This answer satisfied Pilate that our Lord had no such ambitious schemes of earthly domination as the Jews alleged against him; and he candidly acknowledged, ‘ I find no fault in him.’ It is difficult to imagine what there is in such a declaration of our Lord's, which forbids, or even discountenances, such an establishment and alliance of religion with the state as that now contended for. On this point it has been well said, ‘ It is not necessary to conclude from this natural independence of the church on the civil powers, and her inherent competency to her own support, that she was for ever to remain in the same separate condition in which she was originally left by our Saviour and his Apostles. When the rage of persecution had ceased, and the rulers of the world, themselves converted to the faith, evinced a disposition to protect and honour her, it would be difficult to have assigned any plausible reason for her absolutely refusing that protection, and

despising that honour. So to have interpreted the declaration of Christ, that 'His kingdom was not of this world,' would have been consistent with nothing but the most senseless fanaticism, and, in truth, would very materially have impeded the extension of His kingdom among men.

"Though *not of the world*, it was, at least *in it*, and established in it for its conversion and salvation: objects far more likely to be obtained by conciliation and friendly intercourse than by maintaining the proud distance of continued separation. The prophetic intimations of her destined greatness were calculated to give her a far different impression of the course which it became her to pursue. She could not but anticipate the day when 'kings' should be 'her nursing fathers,' and 'their queens' her 'nursing mothers;' when 'the Gentiles' should 'come to her light,' and 'kings to the brightness of her rising.' And when the actual arrival of that auspicious era opened to her the prospect of establishing an harmonious union between the ordinances of man, and the institutions of Christ, for their mutual and more effective sanction and support, she could scarcely have hesitated either as to the lawfulness or expediency of the projected alliance, fortified as she must have been by the recollection of that intimate union between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities, which had for ages existed in the Jewish state by the special appointment of Heaven."

We shall now notice some of the prudential considerations touching the union; these are either direct attacks upon its disadvantage, or allusions to the greater benefit a separation would confer upon religion.

Take a specimen of the first. Mr. Binney, of London, says:

"It is with me, I confess, a matter of deep, serious, religious conviction, that the established church is a great *national evil*; that it is an *obstacle to the progress of truth in the land*; that it *destroys more souls than it saves*; and that therefore its end is most devoutly to be wished by every lover of God and man."

This is severe enough, but we would just observe, that it is merely an opinion—that of a Christian man, we doubt not, but still merely an opinion; and, as no facts are mentioned, dependant for its weight upon the authority of an individual. As such, then, we shall treat it, by opposing other dissenting opinions; and first, that of the eminent Matthew Henry:

"Let us much more give God the praise for the *national establishment of our religion*—that the Christian religion, that choice and noble vine which was so early planted in our land, is still growing and flourishing in it—that it is refined from the errors and corruption the church of Rome had, with the help of ignorance and tyranny, introduced; and that the Reformation was in our land a *national act*; that *Christianity, thus purified, is supported by good and wholesome laws, and is twisted in with the very constitution of our government.*"

So far as opinion goes, this is conclusive, for none will dispute Matthew Henry's preeminence.

Dr. Owen viewed the matter in the same light. In a sermon before the Long Parliament, he thus addresses his auditors :

"If it once comes to this, that you shall say *you* have nothing to do with religion, *as rulers of the nation*, God will quickly manifest that he hath nothing to do with you, as rulers of the nation. Certainly it is incumbent on you to take care that the faith which was once delivered to the saints, in all the necessary concerns of it, may be *protected, preserved, propagated*, to and among the people over whom God hath set you. If a father, as a father, is bound to do what answers this, in his own family, unto his children—a master, as a master, to his servants; if you will justify yourselves as fathers or rulers of your country, you will find in your account, this to be incumbent on you."

Again, Mr. James says :

"Not that I mean to say, the churches which have been allied to the state have never done any good. Our own, (the church of England,) for instance, has done an immense service to the cause of religion, both by its vast theological literature, and by its *evangelical ministers* : and never was it more useful in the latter respect than it is this moment." You, who dwell in this town, (Birmingham,) have only to look to the multitudes who crowd our churches, and to mention the justly venerated names of their ministers, to be convinced that the church is dispensing benefits which will make myriads through eternity happy and grateful."

Can this be the establishment which is a "great national evil;" "an obstacle to the progress of truth and godliness in the land;" and which "destroys more souls than it saves?"

We shall not stop to notice the virulence of the Ecclesiastical Knowledge Society's tract; but, for the sake of quoting Dr. Chalmers' able reply, may just allude to an argument broached by some shallow political economist, and adopted, we are sorry to perceive, by those who ought to know better. He objects to an establishment, on the ground that religious instruction should be left to the pure operation of demand and supply, like any article of ordinary merchandise. This is "letting things find their own level" [level] with a vengeance. Dr. C. replies :

"He seems to have overlooked one most material circumstance of distinction. The native and untaught propensities of the human constitution, will always, of themselves, secure a demand for the commodities of trade, sufficiently effective to bring forward a supply equal to the real needs of the population, and to their power of purchasing. But the appetite for religious instruction is neither so strong nor so universal as to secure such an effective demand for it. Had the people been left in this matter to themselves, there would, in point of fact, have been large tracts of country without a place of worship, without a minister. The legislature have met the population halfway, by providing them with a church and a religious teacher, in every little district of the land; and by this arrangement have increased, to a very

great degree, the quantity of attendance, and the quantity of actual ministration. In point of fact, a much greater number of people do come to church, and do come within the application of Christian influence when the church and the preacher are provided for them, than if they had been left to build a meeting-house, and to maintain a preacher themselves. There is a far surer and more abundant supply of this wholesome influence dealt out among the population, under the former arrangement than under the latter one; and it is in this *excess* of moral religious good, which forms the only argument for a national establishment, that I shall now insist upon."

Concerning the relative value of the labours of the church and dissent, we shall again quote from Mr. Meek, (p. 11):

"The necessity and expediency of a national establishment of religion, such as we possess in this country, will further appear by an appeal to facts. Assuming that the calculation is correct which states the number of parishes in England at 10,000, what would, at this time, have been the moral condition of a very large portion of their parochial districts, without that provision for religious instruction ensured to them by the Established Church? It is not too much to affirm that moral darkness would have covered the land, and gross ignorance the people. By a statement published in a dissenting periodical, the number of places of religious worship in England are: of episcopal churches and chapels, (not including the dioceses of Bristol and Rochester, from which no returns were made,) 9983. Of dissenting congregations of every Protestant denomination, (including many places without fixed ministers,) 6422: (giving a majority of churches, amounting to 3561.) If the above calculation, which, coming from the source which has been stated, cannot be questioned, presents us with the true results of dissenting zeal and benevolence, up to the present day, how extensive and awful had been the dearth of religious instruction and influence in this country, but for the Established Church!"

We have thus entered minutely into the consideration of the junction of church and state, on the grounds of right and of expediency, and we trust we have done so fairly and without bitterness. We feel no offence at others for differing with us, and our only prayer is, that whilst thus externally divided, we might enjoy the "unity of the spirit, in the bond of peace;" and that upon us all may be poured the "spirit of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." It deeply grieves us, however, to see the attacks daily made upon the church, and which, unless God interpose, will, we fear, succeed fatally as to our national establishment. O, it pains us to the very heart to see the unqualified bitterness which bars the arrows flung from a brother's hand, at an institution so loved, so venerated.*

* It is a gratifying circumstance to be able to except from our affectionate censure our dissenting brethren of this city and country generally. May they ever preserve their godly simplicity, and differ with us in love, so that

Want of space obliges us to leave untouched the other parts of Mr. Meek's admirable volume: enough, we trust, has been said to induce our readers to obtain it for themselves. We cannot conclude this notice better than in the touching words of an author whose work* will be reviewed in our next number:

"To some persons, perhaps to many, it seems probable that in a few years the church of England will be no more! And then—God knows what then. If he have decreed her fall, it behoves us to bow in meekness to his heavenly dispensations. As Christians we must be resigned; and yet, can we refrain from tears? It is not sinful if a child put on mourning for its parent: and oh! is she not our parent? Her benediction visited us almost as soon as the breath of heaven. She washed us in her baptismal fount; she hallowed our infancy; she taught us to lisp the endearing names of God and of Christ; she nurtured us in her bosom; she laid before us whatever is great and dignified, whatever is august and glorious in religion, philosophy, and learning! Unto her we are indebted for a Hooker, and a Taylor; for Bacon and Newton; for Bentley and Porson! And now that she is everywhere reviled and persecuted; now that she is hunted down by Papists, by Unitarians, by infidels; and—can it be that professing Christians join them? If we cannot save her from destruction, shall we not bear her pall, and be the mourners at her grave?—She sat by our cradle; let us gather round her tomb.—There is one death to which her enemies cannot doom her. They cannot efface her from our remembrance. O, angel of our childhood, instructor of our youth, director of our age; thou whose enemies would degrade thee to their level, because they cannot attain thy greatness; thou wilt not perish altogether! Thou wilt be enshrined in the temple of our hearts; embalmed in gratitude, and immortalized with praise!"

their prayers and ours be not hindered: whilst each party occupies the sphere God has assigned to it, may our hearts be linked together by the love of Christ, and our labours all tend to his glory.

• Discourses on the Greek Fathers. By H. S. Boyd, Esq.

IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—May I beg you will have the goodness to permit me, through the medium of your periodical, to make a few observations on a letter on "Imputed Righteousness," which appeared in your Number for August.

The view which the writer conceives to be scriptural is, "that the work of Christ, upon the cross, is the sole meritorious source of the believer's justification through faith;" and with this he contrasts what appears to him a different view, viz. "that besides the removal of guilt by the death of Christ, it is necessary that his perfect obedience to the law should be imputed to the believer, to constitute his righteousness and title to reward." On the contrary, I consider those statements perfectly in unison with each other. I conceive that the distinction frequently made between our Saviour's works into active and passive, is altogether groundless: when he suffered he obeyed, and when he obeyed he suffered. But, at the same time, I believe, that remission of sins is the consequence of his atonement, *considered as such*, and that our acceptance as righteous is the consequence of his *obedience*; and I am inclined to think that much confusion and misstatement may be traced to our frequently not distinguishing between our Saviour's work upon the cross, as it was an atonement for sin, and as it was the consummating act of his perfect obedience. Accordingly, I believe that it is confounding two things, perfectly distinct, to ascribe our forgiveness to our Lord's obedience, considered simply *as obedience*, or to ascribe our acceptance as righteous to his atonement, considered simply *as atonement*. The work of our Lord upon the cross may be considered in the twofold light of atonement and obedience, to which his whole meritorious life was leading. His life was one of suffering and obeying humanity. His sufferings were the consequence of our transgression, and were brought to their height, and consummated in that one work of awful suffering, which terminated in his death. This constituted our Lord's complete atonement for our sins. His obedience was not constituted, I conceive, by a series of *distinct actions* from those which constituted his sufferings. These were all acts of holy and devoted obedience; and, in this respect, are not to be considered in the light of atonement. The obedience of his life was brought to its height, and consummated in that same work of unreserved obedience to his heavenly Father's will, of "laying down his life" upon the cross. Your correspondent has, perhaps unconsciously, adopted a term in this statement which completely accords with the view I have given, viz. "the *work* of Christ upon the cross." Had he said, "the *atonement* of Christ,"

which, according to his view, would, I conceive, be the more correct expression, I should have objected to the statement.

I shall now endeavour, first, to show that the arguments by which he attempts to disprove imputed righteousness are inconclusive; and second, to establish the doctrine by scripture proofs.

In the first place, then, I would observe, that his leading proposition, viz. "That innocence, or freedom from sin, is identical with righteousness," is only true as it regards *personal* righteousness. In this respect, I consider the proposition clearly argued, and fully established; for certainly the only man who is *free from sin* is he who "has done all that was commanded him;" so that to be free from the commission of sin is equivalent to the performance of all obedience. If any have argued the necessity for imputing the obedience of Christ to the believer upon this ground, as your correspondent supposes is most commonly the case, their position must be weak indeed; but his mistake seems to lie wholly in this, that he confounds freedom from personal sin with pardon of sin, or freedom from the punishment of sin. Now, though freedom from *personal transgression* does clearly imply perfect *personal obedience*, and could not exist without it, yet it by no means "follows as a necessary consequence" that "*remission* of sins is tantamount to *imputation* of righteousness. A criminal may be tried, convicted, and sentenced to death, and may afterwards be pardoned and set free from all the judicial consequences of his transgression; but he never can be regarded as a man who has not transgressed. He is a *guilty man pardoned*, and in a very different state from him who has been tried, pronounced *not guilty*, and *acquitted*. We never could confound two things in common life so perfectly distinct. We would at once admit, that if a man never *broke* the law, he must, of course, have *kept* the law; these are two things which are perfectly identical; but we never would think of setting up this as a proof that a condemned culprit having obtained his sovereign's pardon, was tantamount to his being considered as perfectly obedient to all his laws. In virtue, indeed, of our union with Christ our head, these blessings are never separated; for he who is in Christ is *accounted* to have atoned for his sins, which were laid upon his substitute; and by that same union is accounted *never to have sinned*, or what is tantamount to it, to have been perfectly obedient, having the obedience, or *freedom from sin*, of his substitute, laid upon him. I trust that I have now shown the fallacy of your correspondent's argument, drawn from reason and common sense, to prove the identity of remission of sins with imputation of righteousness.

In the second section, under the head of his first proposition, he endeavours to establish this identity from Scripture. Let us consider the passages adduced to prove it. The first is Isa. liii. 11. "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities." In order to understand

fully the sense of this, and similar expressions, we must ascertain the meaning of the term *justify*, when it occurs in Scripture; and here I am perfectly satisfied with your correspondent's explanation, and conceive that he has proved it correct, by the scriptures which he has adduced; viz.: "That the word *justify*, in its doctrinal sense, is *acquittal from charge*; and is expressive of nothing more than the innocence of the party." But here again he confounds *acquittal from charge*, in consequence of personal innocence, with remission of sins after actual guilt. I readily grant that the Holy Spirit employs terms, properly meaning "acquittal from charge," to express the blessed consequences of the imputation of righteousness: but let it be remembered that "acquittal from charge" is not merely forgiveness of sins, but a declaration that the accused party *has not sinned*, or is innocent. Now, keeping this meaning of the term "justify" in view, let us consider how we are said to be justified, i. e. acquitted from charge; or declared innocent by the work of Christ upon the cross. In all such passages we are undoubtedly to consider that work as the consummating act of our Lord's obedience, which consisted eminently in his "laying down" his life; and hence, speaking of this manifestation of love, he says, "this commandment have I received of my Father." It was in offering up the body that had been prepared for him as a sacrifice for sin, that he did the will of his Father. "In burnt offerings and sacrifice for sin thou hast had no pleasure; then said I, lo! I come to do thy will, O God; by the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ." Heb. x. 6, 7, 10. His sufferings and death are expressed by active terms—such as that he "*gave himself* for our sins." Gal. i. 4. "*Gave himself* for us as an offering, and sacrifice to God." Eph. v. 2. "*Gave himself* a ransom." 1 Tim. ii. 6. "*Laid down* his life." John, x. 15. And "*offered up himself* to God." Heb. vii. 27. ix. 14. Hence, also, it is said that he "became *obedient* unto death, even the death of the cross." Phil. ii. 6, 11. Thus it appears that his giving up his life, is eminently that one righteousness, or act of obedience, by which we are justified. All that preceded his death must be considered as leading to it, and as having its end in it. It will be observed that I do not consider the work of our Saviour upon the cross in the light of atonement, when tracing to it our justification or acquittal from charge; hence we see how Isaiah declares, that by the righteousness of Christ, or perfect obedience to his heavenly Father's will, in bearing the punishment of our iniquities even unto death, he should justify his people.

The next passage is from Acts, xiii. 38, 39. "Through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and all who believe are justified from all things." Your correspondent says he thinks it will scarcely be denied that the "forgiveness of sins," in the first of these verses, is the same blessing spoken of in the second—"justified from all things." Now, if we understand the

term "justify," in the sense which he attaches to it himself, viz. to acquit of charge, or declare innocent, which I believe to be its true meaning, it is evidently to be distinguished from forgiveness of sins, since forgiveness implies non-innocence, or guilt.

The last passage is from Rom. iv. 6-8: "As David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." The meaning is perfectly intelligible; for justification always implies and includes forgiveness; so that all who are acquitted, or declared innocent in Christ, are also pardoned; and hence the term "justify," as well as the expressions, "not imputing sin," imputing righteousness," &c. are frequently used with reference mainly to the blessing of forgiveness implied and included; hence the expression, "justified from all things."

Your correspondent's second proposition, "that remission of sins is constantly, in Scripture, ascribed to the work of Christ upon the cross," is one which I fully acknowledge; but I cannot conceive how the truth of it affords any ground for denying another truth equally evident; or why it follows, that because remission of sins is ascribed to our Lord's atonement, imputation of righteousness *cannot* be ascribed to his obedience; nor, indeed, why both may not be ascribed to the same work, considered in the twofold light of atonement and obedience. I am willing to acknowledge, therefore, his third proposition, "that righteousness and justification are said in Scripture to flow from the same work upon the cross;" but it appears to me that, unless it can be proved that remission of sins, and imputation of righteousness, flow from that work *in the same sense*; i. e. unless it can be shown that imputation of righteousness flows from it, considered simply *as an atonement*, in which sense it procures remission of sins, the point is not established. That the Apostle did not consider it simply as an atonement, when ascribing to it our justification, appears evident from the very passage on which your correspondent so much relies, viz. Rom. v. 19, where the application of the term *obedience*, seems evidently designed to set it in a different point of view. Indeed, your correspondent's reasoning upon this very passage proves that he regards the *εως δικαιωματος*, or work of Christ upon the cross, to be spoken of here in the sense of active obedience; and he quotes Phil. ii. 8, to which I have already referred in proof of the same view, though immediately after he again confounds this twofold sense, and declares his conviction that imputed righteousness flows from the work of Christ upon the cross *considered as an atonement*.

The passage in 2 Cor. v. 21, admits of an easy and simple explanation according to this view. I would understand the Apostle as declaring that "God hath made Jesus, though perfectly

righteous, to bear *our* sins, that we, having our sins pardoned through that atonement, might bear *his* righteousness."

The fourth proposition is, "That the death of Christ has satisfied the law." On this your correspondent argues that *atonement* satisfies the law. This I cannot admit or conceive. When the law was broken, an atonement was required to satisfy *justice*, but not to satisfy *the law*. Nothing but perfect and unsinning obedience can accomplish this. The law demands not atonement, but *fulfilment*, to "magnify it, and make it honourable;" and this was completely effected in the spotless life and voluntary obedience, even unto death, of our blessed Redeemer. His life of suffering was a life of obedience; and his final passion on the cross, considered in connection with the hallowed principles, motives, and views, which actuated him in becoming voluntarily submissive to it, was that wondrous act of unreserved obedience which crowned the whole, and not only "made an end of sin, but brought in everlasting righteousness."

The position at the conclusion of the letter, that "had the debt been paid *by* us, or *for* us, no atonement could have been demanded," is not, I conceive correct. Our debt is two-fold, *obedience* to a law given, and *atonement* for a law broken. It does not follow that, because our debt has been paid in one respect, it may not be demanded in another: or, in other words, that if obedience had been rendered for us by one substitute, he need not have atoned for our sins.

As I have already trespassed so long, I shall not at present bring forward those passages of Scripture which appear to me to afford positive and satisfactory proof of the blessed doctrine of imputed righteousness, but may, perhaps, ask permission to do so upon a future occasion.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

I. A.

IMPUTED RIGHTEOUSNESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—Your kindness in having published, in the number for August of your valuable Magazine, a communication on the subject of Imputed Righteousness, encourages me to address to you some further observations on the same important subject.

I have met with only two objections to the view of the doctrine which I have proposed, that appear to me to require consideration.

1. The righteousness supposed to issue to the believer from the Redeemer's work upon the cross alone, can only be an imaginary one.

2. To attribute the entire work of atonement and satisfaction of divine justice to the sacrifice of the cross, leaves no adequate reason to account for the sojourn of the Lord Jesus upon earth during a period of thirty years and upwards. His death, had that been sufficient, might have been permitted to take place in his infancy, or at least might have been submitted to at an earlier period of life than we know to be the fact.

1. The righteousness ascribed to the death of Christ, as its sole source, is an imaginary righteousness.

If this objection were well-founded, the believer's title to be admitted into heaven should be sought in something beyond the sacrifice of the cross; but it appears to me to be founded in a misapprehension of the subject. The imputation of righteousness must be, under any view of the question, an imaginary process. But that innocence, with reference to the divine law, amounts to actual righteousness, and consequently that remission of sins, or declaring innocent is tantamount to a declaration of the sinner's righteousness, and the accounting him righteous whom God pardons, has, I think, been established in my former communication. A few additional considerations will lead to the same conclusion. Sins may be distinguished into sins of commission and omission. Now, if the Lord, by an act of grace, *forgive iniquity*, and cease to *impute sin*, He necessarily absolves, and acquits the sinner of having committed actual offence, or of having omitted any duty, i. e. accounts Him to have *done all* duty. And if Christ, by suffering, *take away the sins* of his people, and remove them *as far as the east is from the west*, so that they have *no more conscience of sins*, it is plain that the righteousness obtained through faith in the death of Christ is a real, and not an imaginary title, and renders it unnecessary to suppose or desire a transfer of another's perfect obedience.

The following passage from a commentary on the Ephesians to the Romans, by Professor Stuart, of Andover, (a work which ought to be in every theological student's hands,) favours the

view of justification here maintained, and confirms me in the opinion that that view is countenanced by St. Paul, in Rom. iv. 6-8.—Vide Brit. Ed. p. 83:

"That the idea of *pardon*, or *remission of the penalty threatened by the divine law*, is the one substantially conveyed by *δικαιωσις* and *δικαιωσιν*, as generally employed in the writings of Paul, is most evident from Rom. iv. 6, 7; where the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord imputes *δικαιωσιν*, i. e. reckons, counts, treats as *δικαιος*, is thus described: 'Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes not sin,' i. e. whom He does not treat or punish as a sinner."

"In the same sense we have the word *δικαιωσις*, in Rom. iii. 24, 26, 28, 30; iv. 2, *et al. saepe*; so Acta. xiii. 38, 39; Luke, xviii. 14, &c.

The satisfaction of the law, which is equally indispensable to salvation, and inseparably connected with justification, is an object which *does* require the performance of an actual work to effect. Either the commands of the law should be obeyed, or the penalty it denounces must be endured. Its precepts have never, I will venture to affirm, been observed universally and literally by any human being. This might, perhaps, be made a question with respect to the Lord Jesus. I shall here only touch upon it with this remark, that Christ, whilst He fulfilled the prophecies and types of the old covenant, which related to Him, with scrupulous exactness, and in detail, does not appear to have studied the same universal and detailed performance of the injunctions of the moral law. As our Redeeming Substitute, however, He has sustained the penalty of the violated law; and the result to his people is, according to the following Scriptures, complete pardon and redemption, with an *eternal inheritance*. Gal. iii. 13.; Heb. ix. 14, 15.

2. If the satisfaction of the law, and the believer's title, have been effected by the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, there appears no adequate reason to account for his sojourn upon earth, during thirty years and upwards. His death, had that been sufficient, might have taken place in infancy, or at least have been submitted to at an earlier period of life than we know to be the fact.

Whether this objection be solid or formidable I do not pronounce: I have heard it proposed seriously. In reply, it may be observed, the purpose of Christ's mission was not simply to make atonement for sin, it was manifold. Prophecies were to be accomplished in Him, predictions assigning to Him offices and works, which would, in the performance, occupy a considerable space in the life of an individual, especially many in the Psalms: Isaiah, liii. and lxi.; Daniel, ix. 24, 25, 26, 27. Our Lord, therefore, came to set up a kingdom; He laid the foundation of it; went about preaching it; appointed its first ministers; and left discourses to be its inexhaustible treasure of instruction. I speak of his life on earth.

He left us also an *example*, an infinitely precious pattern, that we should follow his steps. Oh, that all who name the name of Christ, would study and imitate that perfect model! Then peace should be upon the Israel of God.

One important circumstance, which has not been adverted to as it ought, bears upon this subject. It should be remembered that Christ, in his human condition, acted in a subordinate capacity. By humbling Himself to be a man, He made Himself subject to God and to His law. He is often described in prophecy as a *Messenger*, and a *Servant*. In these characters He owed perfect obedience to Jehovah. By submitting to circumcision, He further became a *Debtor to the whole law*: Gal. v. iii. Accordingly, the language and conduct of our blessed Lord, uniformly acknowledge the obligations under which He was thus placed. "It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." His payment of the tribute, Matt. xvii. 24—27, conveyed a similar confession. "Which of you," He asks, "convinceth me of sin." Again, "If I have done evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me?" John, viii. 46; and xviii. 23; expressions implying subjection to some law. Even his death is characterised as an act of obedience, Philip, ii. 8.; Heb. x. 7. It was acceptable and valuable because voluntary, and the act of one who *had power to lay down his life, and power to take it again*. But it was the work also of the Messenger and Servant of Jehovah, commissioned to *take away* and abolish sacrifices, by *offering Himself once for all*: vide Heb. x. 5—9. The execution of this latter purpose was the work of *obedience*.

Viewed in this light, the obedience of Christ, whilst he continued upon earth, was needed *for Himself*, and necessary to constitute Him a fit victim of Divine Justice. How then can His compliance with all righteous ordinances and precepts, to which He was engaged as a man and a Jew, be regarded or accepted as a vicarious obedience for others? Indeed the doctrine which is here contended against, would appear to involve its advocates in either of two errors, held respectively by two sects, whose opinions they would be the last willingly to lend their support to. It has been justly observed, that to speak of Christ's *obedience* considered as a Divine Person, would be at least approaching very near to Arianism. On the other hand, to suppose that His obedience in His human character, was intended to form a treasure of merit for the supply of all believers, would be to adopt a sentiment bordering closely on the Popish doctrine of *supererogation*.

In offering the remarks contained in this and my former communication, my sincere desire is to suggest a more simple and intelligible mode of explaining the doctrine of justification than that adopted by many pious writers and preachers, who labour under what I conceive to be a misapprehension of the subject, and, in consequence, deal in language unauthorized by the Word of God, or the dictates of common sense. What, but such miscon-

ception, can account for the statement in any writer, that the testimony of Scripture, concerning justification, is, that *besides* the pardon of their iniquities, the covering of their sins, it includes *also* the imputation of righteousness to them? What, but inattention to the phraseology of the Bible, could lead to the familiar use of the phrase, "the imputed righteousness of Christ; unsanctioned by the example of any inspired writer? And what, but an indiscriminating attachment to the opinions and style of a theological system, could continue to give currency to scriptural language in a sense never contemplated by its Divine Author, as in the instance of the phrase, "finished work," so commonly employed by preachers to designate the work of atonement and satisfaction; but which, throughout the Gospels, is, in whole or in part, applied to every branch of our Redeemer's earthly task, *except* that of *making his soul an offering for sin*.*

I conclude with a passage from an elegant writer, the language of which cannot be censured by the most fastidious:

"I think he may be taken to hold all that is strictly essential to the Scriptural doctrine of justification, who holds:—that *we are justified by faith only; justified freely by God's grace, without works, when we believe on Him that justifieth the ungodly, and raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead; that, in this justification, our sins are blotted out, and we are counted righteous before God; and that of this free justification, of this pardon of our offences, and of the righteousness thus imputed to us, Christ's work in the flesh† is the proper meritorious source.*"—See *Dr. O'Brien's Sermons, Note, p. 360.*

I remain, Mr. Editor, your obliged humble servant,

E. F. G.

* When our Lord, in the 17th chapter of John, speaks of having "finished the work given unto him to do," He cannot surely allude to what was still to cost him so much agony and sweat. Even when He said, "It is finished," he had not yet *poured out his soul unto death*. I cannot omit noticing a peculiar act ascribed to Christian faith by some, that of appropriating the righteousness of Christ to the believer. This quality of faith formed a prominent topic, not long since, in a sermon by a pious person, upon Rom. iii. 24, 25; where Christ's *blood* is the object proposed to faith.

† The expression, "Christ's work in the flesh," as above employed, I would understand as deriving its sole scriptural signification from such texts as John, vi. 51, latter clause; and Heb. x. 20.

REV. HUGH WHITE'S SERMONS.*

THE intention with which these Sermons were committed to the press, and the object their pious author had in view, can be better stated in his own words than any we could use :

“ Among the consolations which have been mercifully mingled in that cup of trial—(and blessed be the God of all comfort ! they have been neither few nor small)—one of the sweetest has been the preparation of this volume of Sermons for the press, as it kept before my mind the cheering thought, that I might thus, though parted, be in one sense present with you,—and though silent, still speak to you of those glad and glorious tidings, which I so much delighted, while health permitted, to proclaim amongst you.

“ How often, when weakness and weariness had almost weighed me down, have I been roused into pleasurable exertion, and revived with refreshing comfort, by the sweet hope which strengthened and encouraged me in my work, that through the power of the Holy Spirit, these sermons might be blest to you ; might warn away from destruction, and win over to Christ, some wanderer from the paths of peace, with whom I had often pleaded in vain ; and stir up those amongst you who already know, love, and confide in the Lord Jesus Christ, as your own almighty and all-sufficient Saviour, and Friend, to adorn the profession of His gospel by a more Christ-like character and conversation ; and while trusting for pardon and salvation *exclusively* in His *alone* meritorious cross and passion, to live in all things more devotedly to the glory of Him who died for you ; and thus be enabled to go on your heavenward way rejoicing—resting in the love of the Father—walking in the footsteps of the Son—and gladdened with the comforts of the Holy Ghost.

“ Such was the hope that cheered me, while engaged in preparing this volume for publication. I would now entreat of you, my beloved friends and flock, to regard it as a testimony, how fondly and gratefully, though no longer allowed to minister amongst you, I bear you, and all your affectionate kindness in my memory, and my heart ; and may that Spirit, whose prerogative it is to glorify Christ, render it a channel for conveying to your souls an abundant supply of spiritual peace and joy, from their inexhaustible Fountain above.”

And we do sincerely believe that the hope so endearingly expressed, and the prayers so ardently breathed, will be heard and answered ; for as it would be impossible to read the Sermons without feeling deep respect for their author, so it would be diffi-

* Twenty Sermons, preached in St. Mary's Chapel of Ease, by the Rev. Hugh White, A.M. Curate of St. Mary's Parish. Third Edition, 8vo. Dublin: W. Curry and Co; London: Simpkin and Marshall, J. Nisbet, and Hatchard and Son; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, Waugh and Innes, Oliphant and Son, and Whyte and Co. 1834.

cult to do so without being interested by the high and holy themes which he endeavours to enforce; and that without seeking any of the adventitious popularity connected with subjects that, bubble-like, rise to, and explode upon the surface of the religious world. There is much of sobriety and sound feeling in the following observations:

"I need scarcely remind you, before whom these Sermons were delivered; that, in them you will find nothing new or strange in doctrine brought before your view; for however reasonably it may be expected, that as unfulfilled prophecy advances to its accomplishment, new light will break upon those parts of the Word of God, where its predictions are announced with an intentional obscurity, which was designed to be gradually cleared away by their progressive fulfilment—and thus the infidel's scoff be silenced—and the believer's faith confirmed—sure I am that no new article of saving truth, no doctrine to be believed as of necessity for salvation, remains to be discovered in our day."

* * * *

"It is manifestly, to each individual, of immeasurably greater interest and importance, to ascertain on scriptural grounds, whether he is himself capacitated for sharing in the triumphs of Messiah's reign, by being a loyal and obedient subject of that spiritual kingdom of the Son of God, which (with whatever of visible splendour it may be eventually invested) is, in its *very essence*, as to its constitution and glory, 'righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.'

"There is a tendency, in the present day, to approach Scripture in a spirit of rash and presumptuous speculation, rather than of sober and reverential research; to elevate points of confessedly great—but still subordinate—importance to an undue prominence in the Christian scheme, as if they were the very sun of the system, instead of (what they can at most but be) its attendant satellites; and to prefer those portions of the Divine Record, which are easily perverted or mistaken, so as to excite, dazzle, and bewilder the imagination, to those which are specially designed to form the character, and regulate the life, so as to mould them into a conformity with Christ, and a meetness for heaven.

"The evils that have resulted, as might have been apprehended, have indeed been great and glaring.

"A frightful mass of high-sounding, but hollow and heartless profession—unsanctifying, and therefore unsaving, has prevailed. A restless kind of religion, exhibiting more of the overstrained and dangerous excitement of mental fever than the sober and salutary activity of spiritual health, has become fashionable. An Athenian spirit, ever desiring to hear or tell some new thing—as if Christianity was designed to furnish matter merely for curious inquiry, or amusing conversation—has been fostered; and last, and perhaps worst of all, disunion has been created among those, whom love to the same Saviour ought to have linked together, as the members of one holy and happy family, in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace; and thus the strength, which should have concentrated against the enemies of our common Chris-

tianity and church, (and which might then, with God's blessing, have proved invincible,) has been worse than wasted in the weakening divisions, and embittering animosities of a civil war."

We lament to think that there is much of truth in the foregoing extract, and that our own religious community experiences its share of the evils. There is much of irregular and extravasated religion at present about, which having given the reins to imaginations wild and ungoverned, and forgetting equally the character of the church and the Gospel, make of the one a scene of wild uproar, and of the other a subject, not of edification or communion, not of comfort and consolation, but of presumptuous inquiry, ungodly disputation, and overweening and headstrong curiosity. The zeal and earnestness, and frequently the piety of such persons, recommend them even to the devoted members of our church, too many of whom are well disposed to receive their instructions by an Athenian love of novelty, and an uninfluencing familiarity with the language and theory of religion. We exhort our readers to remember, that there may be much deep and practical error associated with even correct views of the vital truths of religion; and that wildness of speculation, once admitted, must tend, not only to mar the external beauty of our Jerusalem, but to sap and undermine its foundation. We know that the bitterest enemies of our church are to be found among those religious Jacobins, whose motto is "overturn, overturn;" and who are proceeding in their reckless course, introducing confusion into the interpretation of Scripture, disorder into the true church of God, and heresy into its doctrines. The growth of error is like the letting out of water: the progress from discussion to doubt, and from doubt to implicit faith, is frequently most rapid, and those who once would have shrunk with horror from subjects, now openly avow their belief in the disgusting heresy connected with the Irvingian views of the humanity of the Redeemer, or disproving the eternity of future punishment.*

Mr. White may well say, "That there is nothing in these Sermons calculated to spread these dreadful evils, I can safely affirm;" and we cordially admit it; and we rejoice to think that there is not a line in his publication that is not rather fitted to withdraw from such evils, by an exhibition of the importance and the loveliness of Christianity, by presenting nobler themes for consideration, and enlisting the affections on the side of religion.

Mr. White's volume is intended for the more refined classes of

* We do not allude in these observations to the late meetings for prophetic inquiry. Highly as we disapprove of such meetings, deeply as we regret the style of the subjects there discussed, and much as we lament the presence of clergymen of the Established Church sanctioning such discussions, our observations are not directed to them. Any one acquainted with the state of religion, and the attempts made equally upon discipline and doctrine by some of the initiated, will understand our allusion.

society. Some observations we ventured on two of his sermons; published some time since in the *Irish Pulpit*, are true of this volume; but we think that the peculiarities we attributed to them are less prominent; while the same gentleness of spirit, the same devotedness of feeling, and the same copiousness and beauty of expression are conspicuous. We quote at random, in order to allow our readers to taste enough to induce them to purchase the volume, if indeed, in the well-merited demand, a copy is to be had :

"Is not this a sight that may well make angels wonder. And yet, perhaps, earth affords a sight yet more calculated to fill heaven with astonishment. It is man refusing to listen to a beseeching God; it is the creature turning a deaf ear to the entreaties of his Creator; it is the rebellious worm spurning the invitations of his imploring Sovereign; it is the sinner leaving the Saviour standing and knocking at the door of his heart, and not merely neglecting to open it, but keeping it fast closed against Him, and with cold contempt, or scornful pride, refusing to receive Him as his guest; and then to think how this insult is aggravated, by the readiness with which the door of the heart is opened to *every other guest*, that knocks for admission there. First, the objects of our earthly love, all that have a just claim on our affections, knock at the door of the heart, and the door is at once opened, and they enter in and dwell there: then *the world* knocks, and the door is at once opened—and the world comes with its train of lying vanities, and cheating promises, and disappointing hopes, and unsatisfying joys, and they enter into the heart, and dwell there; and then *sin* knocks, and the door is at once opened—and sin comes with its train of polluting thoughts, and vile affections, and unhallowed tempers, and abominable lusts, and they all enter into the heart, and dwell there; and then *Satan* knocks, and the door is opened to him—and he comes with his train of impure and accursed spirits, and they all enter into the heart, and dwell there; and then *Jesus comes*, attended by a train of holy and heavenly tempers and affections, hopes and joys—He comes in His own glory, and His Father's glory, and the holy angels with Him, bearing in one hand a divinely-wrought robe of righteousness, and in the other a blood-bought crown of glory, and He stands at the door and knocks—but *the door is not opened to Him!* and He stands there day after day, waiting and knocking, but still the door is not opened; aye, that door which was opened at once to every other guest, from earth or hell, is kept closed—barred, as with bars of iron, against *Him*, and He is left there standing and knocking—and knocking, but knocking in vain! How justly has the human heart, in its natural state, been compared to the inn of Bethlehem, where every guest could find room, and every guest was welcome, except the Saviour of mankind! Really the view of human depravity here unfolded, is perfectly horrifying. To think that *all* claims on our affection are willingly recognized and responded to, *except the claims of God*; that *all* love manifested towards us is gratefully appreciated and returned, *except the love of God*; that He, who has literally loaded us with benefits, lavishing on us His loving kindnesses with more than the

fondest father's bounty, and watching over us incessantly with more than tenderest mother's care; that He who has not merely given us all our blessings, as gifts of His love, but even (oh! unspeakable gift) gave *Himself* for us to death—the death of the cross, to redeem us from eternal death, and exalt us to everlasting life; that *He* should look into our hearts, and there see that every benefactor is gratefully esteemed—*except Himself*; that the heart which glows so warmly towards all around who seek to win its affections, is cold as death towards *Himself*; that while the favour of the great ones of the earth is eagerly courted, *His* favour is contemptuously slighted; that while the overtures of an earthly monarch would be hailed with rapture, and a single smile would intoxicate the soul with joy, *His* offers are scornfully rejected, and *His* smile utterly despised; yea, that with thousands the society of the most abandoned characters, the companionship of the vilest thoughts, the fellowship of sin and Satan is preferred to fellowship with *Himself*; that, in fact, there is nothing so vile, so contemptible, so abominable, that is not by multitudes, (whom He sustains and supplies, amidst all their weaknesses and wants, with His own hand, and has redeemed with His own blood,) preferred to His service, and His blessing, and esteemed an abundant recompense for the loss of all the happiness, flowing from His favour on earth, and His presence in heaven. Oh! surely, there is in this a blackness of ingratitude—a baseness of heart—a degradation of taste—which brands man, while unrenewed by divine grace, a very monster; a hideous compound of pride and meanness; and makes the pretence to goodness of heart, or nobleness of mind, or excellence of character, not merely an unwarrantable boast, but a contemptuous denial of a Saviour's claims, a daring insult to Almighty God."

"If, then, you would look on death as a desirable object, habituate yourself, believer, to view it uniformly in one aspect—as the period of *everlasting separation from sin*; and *everlasting union with Christ*. When you think of the world into which death will introduce you, as one in which *Jesus is*, and *sin is not*, surely this presence of the Saviour, and absence of sin, will make death, as the means of admission into *such* a world, desirable, yea, delightful to contemplate. For what is it, believer, that has been your sorest trial, your deepest affliction, since first you felt the happiness of reconciliation with God, through the death of His dear Son? What has most embittered your sweetest enjoyments, and polluted your purest pleasures? What has most agonizingly constrained you to "groan, being burthened," and to cry out! "Oh! wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" *Has it not been sin*? Sin, that hateful, abominable, accursed thing, which turned paradise into a wilderness; and if it reigned uncontrolled, would make earth a hell. Oh! then, is it not enough to make you in love with death, to reflect, that *the moment* it has released your spirit from its prison-house of corruption—you shall bid an *everlasting farewell to sin*—and from that moment, shall not be defiled by one sinful desire; no, not even have to struggle with one sinful thought, throughout eternity. Believer, will not an eternity without sin be a happy eternity indeed?"

We shall quote a passage from the last sermon, on a subject familiar to the author, "the Christian's release":

"I conjure you then, by all that is bright and blessed in that heaven, its everlasting songs of joy, and hallelujahs of thanksgiving; by all that is dark and dreadful in that hell, its everlasting shrieks of anguish, and wailings of despair; come, oh! come to that almighty Saviour whom you have so long rejected, but who is still willing and waiting to receive—pardon—sanctify—and save you! But come now. You have trifled with Him long enough—Seek the Lord, *while* He may be found: call upon him *while* He is near: lest your day of grace be closed, before your day of life expires; and you learn, by your own experience, the import of those terrific words—whose dreadful meaning, a lost eternity can alone fully unfold, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God—for our God is a consuming fire!" *May God grant that none of you may know on earth, or in hell, what these words mean*; but that you may all be enabled, by divine grace, so to walk in a Saviour's footsteps, and live to a Saviour's glory, so to rely upon His righteousness, and rejoice in His love, that when the angel of death shall be sent to summon you into His presence, you may welcome its approach with a calm and cheerful smile—and glancing with the eye of faith, from the cross where Jesus died to redeem you, up to the heaven where He is ready to receive you, while the dark valley of the shadow of death, through which you are about to pass, is irradiated with the light of His countenance, you may be enabled, with humble thankfulness and holy joy, to take up the language of the text, and exclaim, "Lord! now lettest Thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation!"

It was, perhaps, unnecessary to have extracted so much, as, probably, there are very few readers of the EXAMINER to whom our quotations will be unknown; but, with the book in our hands, we could not refrain marking our respect for their author, our pleasure at finding that the malady which has interrupted his ministerial labours, has not prevented him from being more generally useful than he could have been even in the pulpit, and congratulating him on the well-merited conviction he must have received of the high place which he holds with all whom he values, as devoted to the cause to which he has consecrated his time and talents, his energies and strength.

We are glad to perceive that the volume has already arrived at a *third* edition in a few weeks, an event unprecedented, we believe, in the annals of Irish publishing.

THOUGHTS ON FAITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—Christian philosophy does not embrace within its sacred limits a subject of greater interest than that of faith. Whether we consider the fundamental importance of the doctrine, the difficulties with which it is embarrassed, or the various opinions to which it has given rise—our attention is equally commanded. It is a happy circumstance, however, that a difference of opinion respecting the nature of this principle, may exist in the minds of those whose experience of its operations has been precisely similar; that a mental process, though diversely stated, and variously explained, may be yet identically the same; that conflicting hypotheses, and theories the most irreconcilable, imply no diversity in the phenomenon to be elucidated; that varying sentiments, and speculative differences, may have their foundation in feelings and experiences perfectly identical. Anatomists may variously explain, and differently account for, physical processes and corporeal agencies, to which all are equally subject: and metaphysicians, who alike abstract, imagine, and conceive, may very variously describe these mental powers. And so it is with respect to the spiritual experiences of Christians. They may vary in their views, and differ in their statements, regarding religious feelings and operations, which are yet the same in all: and the faith of the man, who looks upon that quality simply as a real belief in the truths of Christianity, may in no respect differ from that of him who regards it as a distinct and separate faculty.

A conviction of this truth, however, in no wise lessens the importance of correct views, and carefully-formed opinions. Truth upon these momentous subjects is of inestimable value. A diversity of opinion may indeed consist with an identity of actual experience: but he who, upon this plea, resigns himself to contented error, affords reason to question the reality of his piety, no less than the orthodoxy of his creed.

To one who carefully examines the influence and effects of faith upon the minds and actions of believers, and who, from its practical developements and actual operations, endeavours rightly to estimate that faculty whereby we apprehend invisible things; I think it will appear that one important fact connected with it has not met with the deserved attention. The fact to which I allude is, that it is the appointment of Divine wisdom, that the truths and the objects, which faith reveals, shall not act upon the human mind with a force or intensity, in any degree proportioned to their paramount importance; that the stupendous prospects which revelation opens to our view—the eternal enjoyments of heaven, and the never-ending miseries of the lost—that these considerations are not permitted by Providence to engross our thoughts, or absorb our interests, with a power or exclusiveness

in any degree commensurate with their surpassing magnitude. The truth of this position I shall endeavour to establish; and also consider the reasons of so wise and necessary an arrangement.

And, in the first place, I think it evident that, in point of fact, eternal things do not so powerfully operate on the human mind, as their own greatness, and the vital interests which connect us with them, might lead us *a priori* to expect. And here I do not take into consideration the great bulk of mankind, those who are utterly careless about religion, and indifferent to their everlasting interests; who exhibit the unparalleled anomaly, the moral paradox of rational beings, endowed with powers of deliberation, and decision, of choice, and consequent action, capable of being swayed by adequate incentives, of being incited by hope, and deterred by fear; in whose minds, nevertheless, motives the most overwhelming are powerless to excite to action, the most perfect happiness to produce the slightest desire, terrors the most appalling to raise even a transient alarm. But with respect to those who are not of this number, to whom faith has exhibited the all-important realities of another life, and whose lives are not a practical contradiction to their belief, how stands the case? Are their thoughts so much occupied, their attention so much engaged, their happiness and their sorrows so much influenced by the vast prospects which lie before them, as might reasonably be expected? Do those, to whom an assurance of future happiness has been vouchsafed, pass their lives in a state of extatic enjoyment, the consequence of this glorious anticipation? And, if not, how is such a phenomenon explicable upon the ordinary principles of human nature? Shall a prospect of some paltry temporal advantage, an increase of fortune, of reputation, or of rank, be able to raise the drooping spirit, and fill the heart with gladness? And is it in consistency with this, is it a result of the same moral and intellectual conformation, that an assurance of happiness—happiness, boundless, endless, near at hand—shall fail of filling the heart with unceasing rapture, and expelling all grief and sadness from the breast? What! shall time's perishing baubles elate our hearts with joy, and its as fleeting sorrows plunge us in the depths of misery; whilst an assurance of eternity's unfading bliss leaves one wish unsatisfied, one tear to wipe away? Are these things of a piece? Are causes, in these two cases, followed by proportionate effects? Do results, in these two instances, bear a corresponding relation to the sources from which they flow? If then we are compelled to answer these questions in the negative, my first proposition is thereby conceded, namely, that, in point of fact, eternal things do not so powerfully operate on the human mind, as their own greatness, and the vital interests which connect us with them, might lead us *a priori* to expect.

How then are we to account for this fact? I am of opinion that it is the result of a providential arrangement, rendered necessary by the circumstances of our present state; necessary in

order to enable us to take our part in the affairs of this world, as well as to make it a state of trial and probation for another; that without it, we could neither carry on the business of the present life, nor find in it a suitable preparation for a better. That this arrangement is essential to enable us to act our part upon the stage of the present world, can admit, I think, of little question. Is it not clear, that if the degree in which eternal things occupied our thoughts and commanded our attention, bore any proportion to their own immeasurable importance, such a total absorption of the mind would utterly disqualify us from taking our proper share in the concerns of life; from engaging in its employments, and transacting its affairs? Suppose an individual to foreknow, that, in a few short years, he was to experience some mighty temporal change, for evil or for good; that he was to be immured in a dungeon, blackened with infamy, and agonized with torture; or that he was to be exalted to a throne, ennobled by fame, and put in possession of whatsoever contributes to mental enjoyment and sensual gratification; what effect would this prescience have upon his intervening life and conduct? Would not this overwhelming prospect so engross every feeling and interest of his mind, as to incapacitate him from bestowing a single thought upon any other object? And what is the anticipation here supposed, when placed in comparison with that which revelation sets before the believer's mind? What proportion does an earthly sceptre bear to a heavenly crown, the transitory sufferings of a prison to the never-ending miseries of hell? These considerations irresistibly lead us to conclude, that, if the truths and the prospects which faith reveals to us, were to act upon our minds with an intensity at all proportioned to their overwhelming greatness, we should be unable to act our parts in life; that we should be thereby deprived of the requisite ease of mind, and disengagedness of attention; and that, therefore, the arrangement, by which these consequences are prevented, is to be attributed to a necessary and providential economy.

I am now to consider the second, and by far the most important, reason of this remarkable providential regulation. But before I do so, my subject leads me to notice an observation made by a writer of the present day, which, if the foregoing remarks be well founded, seems to have little weight. That author, having observed that revelation does not afford us much specific information with respect to a future state of happiness, endeavours to account for this fact by the assertion, that, were it otherwise, the splendid prospects exhibited to us, would so totally absorb our interest, as to render us indifferent to the cares and enjoyments of this life. We have seen, however, that the stupendous facts which are now distinctly revealed to us, are calculated, by their overwhelming importance, to engross and monopolise every thought and interest of the mind; and that, nevertheless, in point of fact, they exercise no such influence. The prospects and the truths which revelation discloses, are of a magnitude and

moment sufficient, in accordance with the known principles of the human constitution, to occupy every concern, and paralyse every energy of the mind : yet are these disastrous consequences prevented by a peculiar ordination of Divine wisdom. How, then, are we warranted in presuming, that a revelation of facts, not more interesting or momentous than those already disclosed to us, would exert a power which the latter do not possess ? Why are we justified in supposing that these truths, if made known to us, would act upon our minds with any other than that modified and disproportionate influence, which, as we have seen, characterises the operation of invisible things ? In calculating the probable effects of any supposed event, analogy is our only guide. And, in the present instance, shall we derive our analogy from the general law, which ordains that motives and anticipations shall act upon the human mind with a power proportioned to their cogency and magnitude, and not rather from that deviation from this regulation, which is found universally displayed in the agency of things spiritual and unseen ? These incidental observations I have offered for consideration, since the sparing information which has been afforded respecting our future state, seems a subject not unworthy of attention : and the setting aside a false explanation, if it amount not to the substitution of a better, is at least a preliminary and not unnecessary step.

I am, in the next place, to shew that our future prospects, if permitted to act with unrestrained influence upon the mind, would destroy the fitness of this life, considered as a state of trial and probation for another. And, in order to prove this, it is to be observed, that motives of self-interest may be so overwhelmingly powerful, as irresistibly to determine the conduct ; and that, in such cases, actions, being no longer voluntary, possess neither merit nor criminality. Suppose, for example, an individual to be certainly assured, that a brief abstinence from intoxication, theft, and murder, would be rewarded with wealth, honor, and prosperity ; and that a transgression in any of these particulars, would be punished with agonizing tortures, and an ignominious death. Would not the pleasures of wine, of dishonesty, and of violence, be in such a case irresistibly counterbalanced by more powerful attractions ? And what is the merit of compliance, when the temptations to transgression have lost their power ? What becomes of virtue, if we banish self-denial ? True it is that, when habits of virtue are formed, self-denial gradually merges in self-gratification, duty coincides with inclination. In the formation of these habits, nevertheless, difficulties must have been overcome, and obstacles surmounted : the temptations of vice must have been sensibly felt, as well as successfully resisted ; the pleasures of sense must strongly solicited, as well as finally yielded in the mental conflict. The application of this principle to the case before us is easily made. Were the sanctions of religion, the rewards and punishments of heaven and

hell; to operate on our minds with a force proportioned to their unequalled moment; virtuous conduct, so strongly recommended, would lose its difficulty, and vicious actions, so formidably interdicted, would be scarcely possible. Some arrangement was therefore necessary, by which these consequences might be prevented; by which man might be a free agent; by which the practice of virtue might be attended with difficulty, and the avoidance of vice require exertion. In no other way could these ends have been accomplished, than by a regulation such as I have been considering: a regulation whereby the facts, the prospects, and the motives which revelation discloses, are restrained from acting upon the human mind with a power in any degree proportioned to their own paramount importance.

G. H. W.

DETACHED THOUGHTS.

I. ON THE CHARACTER OF GOD.

WE fear that in almost all controversies the love of truth is alloyed with a desire for victory. Each party appears to take it for granted, that the surest way effectually to overthrow his opponent is, to deny the truth of his opinions 'in toto.'

Now, I think many an error has been left standing, by being thus *overshot*. Let us take our adversaries on their own ground, examine carefully their side of the question; put it to a just and severe scrutiny; admit frankly whatever stands the test, and then shall we more clearly mark the line of separation; more clearly see the point where truth terminates, and error commences. And surely this judicious candour, whilst it benefits our own minds, will be much more likely to convince those who differ from us. The humility arising from a sense of our own weakness and proneness to err, will develop itself in charity towards those who are not more fallible.

Perhaps no subject illustrates this more forcibly than the question of natural religion. It is admitted that the first principle of all religion—the existence of a God—may be inferred, independently of revelation; but further advance is deprecated: a jealous fear of attributing too much value to the discoveries of unassisted reason, has led to its exclusion altogether; and by obscuring the just limits to this mode of investigation, has given the infidel apparent ground for the sarcasm, that the Bible is made to supersede reason, lest that both being allowed, they should come into collision, and their information prove contradictory. But surely this fear of sounding the depths or the shallowness of our own capabilities is unmanly. Truth, then,

must be in every thing: God's truth, as he is the Creator and Disposer of all: and why should we not go forward humbly, yet boldly, till we discern all that we can know by ourselves, and then thankfully acknowledge the goodness which has not left us in ignorance of a clearer light. There is no danger of any *contradiction* being discovered between the character of the God of nature and of grace. He is light, and in him is no darkness at all: and this advantage we shall gain at all events—we shall deprive the arguments of our opponents of their force by adopting all their system contains of truth and rejecting their errors.

All our knowledge of Him “whom truly to know is life eternal,” must be derived from one of these sources: either from the ideas of pure reason—independent of, and superior to all external influences; from the operations of our understandings upon external phenomena; or, from the revelation which God has given of Himself in his word.

Now, before we proceed to estimate *how much* information we may obtain from the two former, I would remark a great and important distinction—a distinction *in kind*, not in degree—between it and that afforded by the Bible as to the character of God. However much or little knowledge may result from the former modes of investigation, it relates only to the divine character considered abstractedly, or at most, in relation to perfect beings. Nothing discovers his relation to *us as we now are*—fallen from our high and holy state—nothing bespeaks a God who hates sin, and yet willetth the salvation of the sinner. All is holy, just, and good; but towards man, as he is *now*, God appears rather as a Judge than as a Father.

This fearful “*Hiatus valde defendendus*” can only be filled up by the revelation he has given. This, and this alone, tells us how “God can be just, and yet the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus.”

Thus, by ascertaining the kind and limits of natural religion, we have removed all cause for slavish fear, all doubt of agreement between God's works and word; and we may now inquire frankly as to what nature—the creation above, around, and within us—will teach us.

Now, as to the idea of God which reason, in its purest and highest exercise, will form, I may observe, that all the attributes will be absolutely perfect, without limitation, and without contradiction. We cannot imagine of God otherwise than as excellence itself; Justice, Mercy, Goodness, Truth, &c., all in their fullest stature, and in complete harmony. Anything short of this would be rejected as inadequate; not from love to the Object, but from an intellectual perception of incongruity. As all the ideas of pure reason are absolute, so any combination of them must be equally absolute. So far the information afforded seems considerable; yet, many circumstances of individual character deteriorate from its practical value. Its truth appears to us unquestionable; yet it is truth hidden at the bottom of a

well, which it requires labour and patience to draw forth. In all respects it is superior to external evidence; it is less doubtful, (let it be remembered that we speak of the *character*, not of the existence of God,) and more consistent; but still it leaves unsolved the question of what God is to us, sinners.

The operation of our understanding upon the external world yields decisive evidence of the existence of God, but we think much less so, as to the peculiar development of his character. Unbounded *power* is every where legible, from the infinitely small Nomad, to the infinity of space: the language of all creation is an ascription of might. His *wisdom* is infinite; from the arrangement of an insect's spiracles, to the muscular combination of the elephant's trunk; from the lowliest vegetable to man himself, with all their wondrous adaptation of means to an end: from the crust of the earth to the stars in their courses, all around, above, and below show forth, in penciling of light, His wisdom who "seeth the end from the beginning." Of His bounteous *goodness* all things living partake, and all rejoice in Him as their Creator and Preserver.

Of His *justice* some shadowings forth are discerned, but much is left uncertain, much that leads us to infer from His other perfections, that a time and a place will be, when this high attribute shall receive fuller and unquestionable illustration.

The regular sequences of nature, summer and winter, seed-time and harvest, night and day, all speak of His *truth*; and though with a still small voice, yet how clear, how audible!

These are some of the principal indications obtained by our understanding. It would be temerity to say they are nearly all.

Fearlessly let us search, and more will be revealed to us. Light, from the Fountain of Light, will beam into our minds with its vivifying radiance; and, if it show how much darkness yet remains, oh! let us thankfully and teachably turn to the Book God has given us, at once the word of knowledge and of life. Here all the deficiencies of our own powers will be supplied; our doubts removed; our minds informed; and we may press on, ever advancing in the path of knowledge; "shining brighter and brighter unto the perfect day."

F.

DETACHED THOUGHTS.

BY THE LATE DR. STOPFORD.

NO. I. ON RELIGIOUS VIEWS AND RELIGIOUS DISPOSITIONS.

WHAT is it that causes you to love some intimate friends more than strangers, but this—that you are *acquainted* with the character of the former, and their dispositions towards you. And does not your disposition and temper here arise from, or is it not connected with, your view and knowledge of the object of your regard?

We may be proud of our views, and also proud of our dispositions; and we may claim salvation, or make a Saviour of them; but should this lead us to undervalue the one or the other?

There may be dry knowledge, and mathematical opinion, about divine things—but should this lead us to depreciate heart-affecting knowledge, and influencing opinions?

You would lament over a man who looked to our Redeemer as dying only the death of a martyr, and not at all for remission of sins; or if he viewed our Saviour as a created angel; and would it not be of great use to his heart and life, to make him change his opinions.

The Lycaonians thought Paul and Barnabas were gods; and with all the heathen, they thought they were governed by deities who were cruel and licentious; was it not a great thing to make them change their views?

Does not knowledge regulate disposition?

We are thinking beings—and it must be of great consequence about what objects we are thinking.

We are members of a large society, and have relations to beings about us which can hurt or help us; and our safety depends upon our knowledge of what is external to us, and what is its real nature.

The child who thinks that the fire is a splendid plaything, and puts his hand into it, is he not injured by wrong opinion, and by want of knowledge of the real character of things about him?

The blind man who is in want of food, may be in a garden where there are fruit trees in one part, and stones only in the other; he may walk towards the latter, and be ignorant of the former, and he is starved for want of clear views of the objects around him.

What is Paul's prayer for the Ephesians and Colossians, but that their minds may be enlightened to know the spiritual objects which are before them.

"That the eyes of your understanding being enlightened, ye may know what is the hope of your calling, &c."

"That ye may know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge."

Paul grounded all his exhortations to tempers, upon *motives*—but do not motives proceed from knowledge and views?

"I beseech you by the tender mercies of God," supposes the mind acquainted with these mercies.

Instead of saying that the speculative people make too much of views—should we not say, they make too little of them; that they do not carry them on to their due effect; they fall short of making them experimental and heart appropriating—from whence all the characters of God being seen, may lead us to say, "He is my Father—my Covenant God and Father."

Jesus Christ is my Saviour, He loved me with surpassing love, and gave himself for me.

June 20, 1807.

NO. II. ON THE DISPENSATION OF THE SPIRIT.

The office of the Holy Spirit should not be considered as *confined* to the creating moral dispositions, and producing moral strength in the heart. 'This is *one* part of the new covenant, "I will put my laws in your hearts."

It is an office of the Holy Spirit to make men willing to be reconciled; to humble the proud heart of man, and convince of sin. "When he cometh he will convince the world of sin."

It is an office of the Holy Spirit to awaken the soul to behold the Redeemer, and to manifest before the heart Him in all his gracious characters. "He will take of mine and show it unto you." "No man can call Jesus Lord, except by the Holy Ghost."

The Holy Spirit helps the heart to pray. "We know not how to pray as we ought, but He helps us with groanings which cannot be uttered."

He brings us into the presence of God. "Cast me not away from thy presence—take not thy Holy Spirit from me."

The Holy Ghost inspires the soul with a *feeling* knowledge of the *love of the Father* towards us; and the love of Christ in dying for us—whence he fills the heart with hope and joy.

"Hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost, that is given to us.—To be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith. To know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge."

"The fruits of the Spirit are love, joy, peace, long-suffering," &c.

The Spirit leads, and guides, and regulates external providences, along with inwardly suggesting directions to the heart.

The Spirit said to Philip, "A man of Ethiopia wants you; go and join yourself to his chariot."

"They that are led by the Spirit of God they are the children of God."

The Spirit introduces us into the heavenly family of God, and makes us behold Him as *our Father*, raising us from the state of a servant to that of a child—an heir.

"We have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirits that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs."

"God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father."

A certain joyful earnest of the glory to come is revealed to the heart, by the Holy Spirit commencing a kind of foretaste of heavenly bliss, which is more than an overbalance for earthly affliction.

"Ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of your inheritance."

It is the office of the Spirit to unite all the members of the church of Christ (however they may differ in external names) into one body; and hence, to make them love one another. "We, being many, are one body; for by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit; so if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it, or one member be honoured all the members rejoice with it."

Therefore it is that the brotherly love of Christians to each other suffereth long and is kind; envieth not; seeketh not its own; is not easily provoked; endureth all things.

Just as in the human body, the mind will bear pain to remove it from the head, and no rivalry which should have the greater weal.

It is the Spirit that unites us together, by uniting us all with our Redeemer, the head.

Monday before Easter, 1808.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Metrical Exercises upon Scripture Texts and Miscellaneous Poems. By Harriet Rebecca King.

As this little volume is the production of a fair lady, we willingly act as master of the ceremonies, and introduce it to our readers. It consists of a series of short hymns, upon different texts, composed, many of them, during divine service, as a preventive of the rambling thoughts which naturally intruded when bodily infirmity deprived her of the power of hearing the sermon. There is a quiet spirit of piety, which will be their best advocate. Our limits forbid our entering into more detail, but we give one extract as "*instar omnium*." It is entitled (pp. 162)

MY MOTHER'S FLOWERS.

Pure relics of as pure a taste
As ever gentle woman graced,
With filial love I place you here,
And greet you with a filial tear.
A tear! how deep its sacred source!
How high the hope that stays its course.

My own dear mother—thine the hand
That traced, the thought that planned.
That precious hand is powerless now,
But still, upon thy placid brow
Pure thoughts are resting, pure and high,
Soaring above mortality.

The stroke to which thy frame resigned
Fell gently on thy nobler mind;
A *bruised reed*, alas! thou art,
But faith's own breathings from thy heart
To heaven in quenchless incense rise,
A holy, humble sacrifice.

And we who gaze upon thee here,
Through nature's dim unbidden tear,
Check the frail feeling in its flow,
And catch from thee the blessed glow
Which chases all our gloom away,
And brightens earth with heaven's own ray.

A Sermon preached on Sunday, the 29th Sept. 1834, in the Royal Chapel of Saint Matthew, Ringsend; in aid of the Irish-town Institutions. By the Rev. Francis Thornburgh, A.B. Dublin; pp. 24.

There is, perhaps, but too little encouragement afforded to the publication of single discourses, delivered by our own clergy, especially if they are young, and unknown to fame; and the consequence is, that few issue from the press. We are not sure that sermons always clear the expense of publishing, even when graced with the names of our most popular divines; and hence, while the Northern and Southern metropolis of the sister island teems with "Pulpits," and "Sermons," such things are scarcely known among us. This is not creditable to the Christian people of Dublin: nor, in discouraging such publications, do they consult their own advantage. We hope for better things.

The sermon, the title-page of which is prefixed to this notice, though the production of a young man, and giving indications of a lively imagination, which will require to be kept under restraint, is, notwithstanding, highly creditable to him for sound views of divine truth, independent thinking, and ardent, and elevated piety. We trust it will get a wide circulation, and thus serve the valuable institutions on whose behalf it was preached, and afford encouragement to the author. It is but fair to add, that it was preached without the design of publication; and was printed only at the request of the managers of the institution.

A Manual of English Grammar, Philosophical and Practical, with Exercises, &c. By the Rev. J. M. McCulloch, Minister of Kelso. 18mo. Edinburgh, 1834.

This is, unquestionably, the production of a man of very considerable talent, and who takes an accurate and profound view of his subject. In the preface he says:

"The first great object of the author has been, to exhibit grammar as a science, rather than an art, and to keep steadily before the mind of the pupil the principle, that grammar rules do not give the law to lan-

guage, but are themselves determined by previously existing usages. "The student who takes the present manual as his guide, will be led to perceive, that grammar, like every other science, is a digest of facts, not a system of rules; that the usages of speech are to the grammarian what the phenomena of nature are to the philosopher; and that as it is not the business of the latter to prescribe laws for the government of the physical world, but simply to deduce them from existing appearances, so it is the province of the former not to dictate what usages ought to be, but simply to discover them."

This is certainly true, and our inference from it would be, that in teaching our children grammar first, we are beginning education at the wrong end. On this subject we can speak personally, as in learning a language (say the German) we never made use of a grammar until after a considerable advance in the acquisition and use of words.

The author advances some new views, and has adopted some different arrangements; and though we may not altogether agree with him, he deserves much credit for acuteness. Upon the whole, there is much to praise in this little work, and it will be found a valuable assistant to those engaged in teaching advanced students.

Our limits prevent our entering into a minute examination of the different parts, but we assuredly wish Mr. McCulloch success in his laudable undertaking.

Helps to Repentance. By Rev. A. Westoby, M. A.

This little volume consists of six lectures, addressed to persons of various ages; preached during Lent. There is nothing very original or very profound in these sermons, but there is what is far more important, sound gospel views, and a due appreciation of the importance of the soul, with an earnest desire for the benefit of his hearers. The first sermon is addressed to little children; then follow those to young persons in early

life; to those in early manhood; to those in the prime of life; to persons above the age of forty years; to those above the age of fifty years—the last especially we admire. If our state be deeply sinful; if our sins need repentance; if, difficult, and painful, and humiliating to the natural heart, as it assuredly is, repentance be the first step in the Christian life, the very portal of the heavenly road—then is this work written for the purpose of setting forth its necessity, of value, and on this account, most sincerely do we wish it God speed.

Hints Designed to Regulate the Intercourse of Christians. By W. Sprague, D.D. Pastor of the second Presbyterian Church in Albany. With a Recommendatory Preface by W. Urwick, D.D. Dublin. J. Robertson & Company. p. 242

There is no subject on which instruction is more required, in this age of almost indiscriminate profession, than that of *Christian intercourse*; and the work, whose modest title is prefixed to these remarks, "*Hints designed to regulate the intercourse of Christians*," happily supplies the desideratum. The subject is unquestionably important, whether considered in reference to individual Christians, or their influence upon society; and our readers will be able to form a tolerably correct judgment of the way in which it is treated, when we give them the following table of contents: The work consists of two parts. First: "Intercourse of Christians with each other;" under which we have—"Objects of Christian intercourse; grounds of Christian intercourse; hindrance to Christian intercourse; mode of conducting Christian intercourse; occasions of Christian intercourse; opportunities of Christian intercourse; Christian intercourse in the family; Christian intercourse of youth; Christian intercourse between the higher and lower classes; epistolary intercourse among Christians; perversion of Christian intercourse; obligations to Christian intercourse from the peculiar character of the age."

The second part is entitled, "Intercourse of Christians with the World." Under this head we have—"The

Christian's intercourse with the world in the common concerns of life; the Christian's intercourse with the world in the social circle; considerations prohibiting the Christian from the gaieties of the world; pleas of the professed Christian for mingling in the gaieties of the world considered; responsibility of Christians in the higher walks of life, in respect to the prevailing conformity to the world; the Christian's intercourse with the unrenewed sinner, in respect to his salvation."

The reader will see from this enumeration, that the deeply interesting subject is fully discussed: and a perusal of the work will leave the conviction in the mind, which rests in ours, that ample justice is done to it in the discussion. We most cordially wish for it a place in every religious library, and in every Christian family circle in the land. It will be, we trust, a blessed means of promoting "pure and undefiled religion,"—of elevating the tone and standard of true practical piety.

Dr. Urwick has laid the Christian community under an obligation of no common kind, in bringing this admirable work before their notice; and the respectable publishers will, we trust, be encouraged by the success of this attempt to enrich our theological literature with many other accessions from the treasury of our American brethren.

—
The Liturgy compared with the Bible; or an Illustration and Confirmation, by Scripture Quotations and References, of such parts of the Book of Common Prayer, &c. as are not direct Extracts from the Holy Scriptures. By the Rev. Henry Ives Bailey. Two vols. London, 1833. Rivington, Seeley, Hatchard.

"As Christ," said an old divine, "so the Church, and as the Church, so the Liturgy of the Church, is crucified between two malefactors"—on the right hand the Papist, on the left the Dissenter, or, as the good old author we have quoted more correctly speaks, the *novelist*; for novel surely and unheard-of by the primitive church are those principles on which the non-conformist grounds his prejudices against the Book of Common Prayer.

It is much to be regretted that Churchmen do not take more pains to instruct their children in the *peculiarities* of their religion; and it is to this neglect that we attribute, in a great measure, the rapid progress of dissent and non-conformity. The dissenter represents his system as all purity and perfection, and inveighs against establishments and episcopacy as all foulness and corruption; nor is it until his deluded victim has run the round of all the sects which the "voluntary" system embraces within its pale, that the real truth is discovered, and he finds himself, like Noah's dove, compelled to return to the ark of God's church, having found no rest for the sole of his foot.

Of the many blessings which the churchman enjoys, there is none in which the superiority of his cause appears, we think, to more advantage than in the power he possesses of satisfying himself that the words in which he addresses the Majesty of Heaven are words which it becomes him to employ. The dissenter, when he enters his meeting-house, and kneels (if he does kneel) to worship at the footstool of the Most High, must trust to the discretion, and the temporary state of mind, of the individual to whom he has committed the leading of his devotions; he cannot be certain that the prayer in which he is about to join will not be filled with impertinencies, extravagancies, or familiarities; he cannot even be certain of the orthodoxy of the sentiments expressed by the minister; and if that minister be unknown to him, this state of uncertainty must continue throughout the whole of his devotions. But the churchman may satisfy himself that his prayers are not only free from improprieties and indecent familiarity, but also that they are scriptural, in a sense to

which no mere stringing together of texts can pretend—not thrown off on the spur of a moment, or fitted to meet the fashionable sentiments of a congregation, but "framed and fashioned" (as Bishop Ridley quaintly says) "to the true regnes" (i. e. reins) "of Holie Scripture."

To assist the churchman in comparing his Prayer Book with his Bible, we strongly recommend the volumes now before us. The plan of the work is extremely simple; the prayers, exhortations, &c. are broken into sentences, which are printed in the margin in a smaller type, and, beside them, illustrative texts of Scripture are given in full; so that the reader may at once perceive how deeply our offices have imbibed the spirit of Holy Scripture, even where they are expressed in human language. The advantages, therefore, of this mode of exhibiting the agreement between the Prayer Book and the Bible are obvious. To use our author's words: "The analogy of their sentiments and language is at once presented in parallel columns on each page, and the reader is furnished with an opportunity of judging of the conformity manifested therein. The ignorant may be informed, and the prejudiced have many of his erroneous notions of the Liturgy corrected; whilst the pious churchman will see that, though its composition be human, its language is divine."

To the pious parent, who desires his child to pray with understanding, as well as with the spirit, we would especially recommend this work; and all who are engaged in the religious instruction of youth, as Sunday-school teachers, &c. will find these volumes particularly useful. We would rejoice to see them reprinted in a cheaper form.

OBITUARY.

JOHN JAMES M'GREGOR.

It is easy to write, in the almost prescribed paraphrase which too generally composes the obituary notices of magazines, where the feelings are not excited, and a duty is merely to be performed that either interest or regard to public sentiment demands.

But to record the death—to pourtray some of the leading characteristics—to recall the recollections of the private life of one, with whom, for many years, you held communion, as a Christian, a scholar, and a friend; one whom you had seen filling with zeal, steady and upright principle, sound, yet unobtrusive talent, the different situations in life in which it had pleased God to place him; adorning all its social charities, as a parent, a husband, and a friend; giving the influence of his character and talent to promote the glory of God, and the temporal and eternal welfare of man; this is no easy task—a task no uninterested stranger could do justice to—no friend can sufficiently command his feelings to perform.

The subject of this notice, John James M'Gregor, was principally known to the public as the author of the first and largest History of the French Revolution, a work which, without interest or capital, published in a provincial town in Ireland, and in despite of its size and price, has attained the proud eminence of ranking among our standard works on history, and claiming a place in every well-furnished library; a work which affords the most minute and accurate detail of that eventful period, and presents to the reader a continued narrative of authentic facts, undistorted by the peculiar views of any party or individual.

Mr. M'Gregor first commenced his literary career as the editor of a provincial paper, the "*Munster Telegraph*." Since the completion of his historical work, he has published a series of Stories, in three volumes, illustrative of the History of Ireland; and during the last years of his life, he edited the "*Primitive Wesleyan Methodist Magazine*," of which pious body he was an exemplary member, and also occupied a situation as literary assistant to the Kildare Place Society, until it pleased the Government to curtail its funds, and deprive many of its efficient and faithful servants of their principal or only means of livelihood. He died at Mount Pleasant, near this city, affording, amid bodily suffering, aggravated by restricted circumstances, a bright illustration of the power and efficacy of that faith and hope, sure and steadfast, by which the Christian soldier, whose mind is stayed on God in Christ, overcometh all things. Yea, though he walked through the valley of the shadow of death, he feared no evil, for the rod and the staff of his God, they comforted him.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,

AND

Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXXVIII. DECEMBER, 1834.

VOL. III.

CROLY ON THE ROMISH CHURCH IN IRELAND.*

How far the influence of the Church of Rome has operated in bringing about the peculiar state in which Ireland is now placed, is worthy the consideration of any intellectual mind, but to a native of the British empire the subject is of deeper importance; and any information that may throw additional light on the matter must be hailed by a subject of King William the Fourth with no small satisfaction. The **CHRISTIAN EXAMINER** was originally instituted to sift and expose the principles and practices of the Romish Church; and in the pages of our periodical, from its commencement to the present day, will be found considerable information concerning papal policy and the practices of the Irish priesthood; and we think we could satisfactorily prove, by a reference to our past labours, that there is scarcely a statement, however startling, respecting the exactions, the influence, the difficulties, or the degradation of the Popish clergy, that has not been placed before the readers of the **CHRISTIAN EXAMINER**. But after all, great is the difference indeed between the credibility of any thing that we could say on the subject, and that of what a parish priest, of irreproachable character, might disclose;

* An Essay, Religious and Political, on Ecclesiastical Finance, as regards the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland; interspersed with other matters not irrelevant to the subject. By the Rev. David O. Croly, Parish Priest of Ovens and Aglin. Cork: Barry Drew; Dublin: William Curry, Jun. and Co. London: R. Groombridge. 1834.

and we greatly rejoice that what we have heretofore asserted is now established beyond even the questioning of the most affected *liberal* in the land, when flowing deliberately, and at the same time feelingly, from the pen of one whose knowledge no man may dispute, whose intellect no man may despise, and whose character no man can impugn. What we had advanced might have been doubted as forged by Protestant malignity, or, at least, received with reservation, as distorted by Protestant prejudice; but who will dishonour the draft of a parish priest? The man, no doubt, has counted the cost of his *exposé*. We are bound to suppose that he is placed beyond the danger of certain starvation, which would assuredly await him, were he unprovided with private funds. We hope, also, he will place his person beyond the risk of an assassin's bullet. Peter Walsh was attempted to be murdered, by exposing, in Charles the Second's time, the foreign-influenced priests. The day for hiring or maddening men to act as assassins is not yet over in our land; and Mr. Croly must stand in the spirit of a lion, or rather that of a Luther, ready to do his duty to his country, in spite of what man or devil can perpetrate against him. He has been, as we are informed, already deprived of his parochial functions by his bishop; he has been excommunicated by his brother priests, and driven from his altar by his furious flock, maddened as they are by bigotry and disaffection. Strong, then, in his sense of duty, he must take his stand with that small, very small band of patriot, God-fearing, but dauntless priests, who at sundry times have stood forth in the Irish Church—with Paul Harris, Peter Walsh, Charles O'Connor, &c. &c., who, content to suffer under sacerdotal excommunication, bore the brunt of the hatred of a priest-ridden populace, while exposing a system where the clergy act so injuriously on the people, and the people react so degradingly on the clergy; where a hierarchy, ruling despotically, and often under foreign influence, and an inferior priesthood, the slaves, and yet abettors, of the VOLUNTARY SYSTEM, unite to counteract the best intentions of the government, and neutralize the many blessings which a bountiful Providence has lavished on our isle.

In order to prepare our readers for the better understanding of Mr. Croly's pamphlet, it may be well to give a brief outline of the church policy of Rome in Ireland, and show, moreover, from the writings of other Roman Catholics, that Mr. Croly is not singular in what he thus states.

There can be no doubt that, in former times, the Church in Ireland had a popular and elective character. The bishops were chosen by the clergy of the respective dioceses; the ecclesiastical government was representative and synodical; the inferior clergy had deliberative rights; and, while independent of the people for their daily bread, they felt and acknowledged that the people, as part of the church, had a well-checked power over their appointment; and no parish priest was collated "*mero motu*" of any one individual, whether bishop, king, or lay patron; but the

person so to be appointed was brought under public examination, was made the object of public opinion, and his nomination rested with a *concursus* of clergymen, duly selected for that purpose.

Doctor Charles O'Connor, in his "Letters of Columbanus," vol. 1, page 82, thus describes the election of an ancient Irish bishop : *

"1. A day is to be appointed by the three senior presbyters of the vacant see, and a place of worship must be also appointed by them, where all those who are in the care of souls are to assemble, for the election of a successor.

"2. Prayers are to be solemnly offered for the election of a man whose morals, learning, and prudence, may qualify him for such a station.

"3. If the diocese affords such a person, the electors are not to elect from another diocese. If it does not, they may elect from another.

"4. Each clergyman is to vote individually, at the foot of the altar, having first ascended to the highest step, and laid his right hand on the Bible, to signify the conscientious integrity of his mind, in voting without any other partiality than that which arises from virtue.

"5. He is to vote by handing to the senior clergyman, who presides, or to any of the provincial suffragans, who may preside, (he having been previously called to the chair by a majority of voices,) a paper, on which the names of the three candidates are written, in the order of preference which that clergyman would assign.

"6. The votes are then to be counted by the president, and the three candidates, in whose favour the majority have voted, are to be presented by a chosen deputation to the metropolitan.

"Lastly. The metropolitan is to agree with the civil power in the confirmation or nomination of one of the three, without any reference to any foreign jurisdiction."

* This statement of Doctor O'Connor, which showed how much the Roman Catholic bishop of Ireland had departed from the usages of antiquity, so offended and annoyed the hierarchy, that they thought it necessary to come to certain condemnatory resolutions concerning the man and his work—one was as follows :

"We are concerned to observe that attempts have been made, and are still persisted in, to mislead the public mind, and that periodical papers, and pamphlets, replete with misrepresentations, are unceasingly employed. Amongst these publications we find it necessary to particularize certain tracts which have lately appeared under the title of "*Columbanus ad Hibernos*," fraught with misrepresentation and calumny, and PRESUMING TO DICTATE, as Roman Catholic tenets, opinions contrary to the genuine doctrines, and subversive of the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church."—Dublin, 18th November, 1812.

Doctor O'Connor was subsequently suspended from his functions as a priest, and was, we believe, formally excommunicated ; but he was, as we trust Mr. Croly is, beyond the reach of the vengeance of the Irish prelates. As librarian to the Duke of Buckingham, his life was spared to bring before the public those erudite and laborious works which will cause his name to survive, when all the bishops, and priests, and demagogues, who persecuted him will be sunk in oblivion.

The inferior clergy, pursuant to the canon of the Council of Trent, were elected in the following manner :

"Let six examiners, men of learning, piety, and morality, be appointed in the diocesan synod, and sworn upon the Holy Evangelists, to act in their office with justice and conscientiousness in the appointment of good pastors to preside over the flock in vacant parishes."

When a parish becomes vacant by the death, resignation, &c. of the pastor, the bishop is to call a "CONCURSUS," viz. :

"To give notice to the coadjutors and candidates of his diocese to come to the place appointed to be examined. The clergymen selected for examiners by the synod are, by virtue of their oath, to examine the candidates with respect to their age, piety, prudence, learning, &c. &c. Afterwards the examiners are to point out to the bishop the most worthy amongst the candidates to fill the situation of parish priest, and the bishop shall give him collation accordingly ; and, on the succeeding Sunday, the appointed clergyman shall go to the parish church, attended by two men, one of whom shall announce to the congregation the new parish priest, read his canonical collation before him, and give him ecclesiastical possession of his benefice."*

This mode of collation seems to us admirable ; and if the Council of Trent had passed as good doctrinal decrees as this excellent one respecting ecclesiastical discipline, and if, which is of much more consequence, the Church of Rome had stood strictly according to such unobjectionable rules, then indeed the separation of Protestants would have been unjustifiable, and the *Reformation* would have deserved the name of a *DEFORMATION*. But, alas ! we do not find that the case. Neither did the Church of Rome adhere to this admirable rule, or the Reformed Church of England adopt any thing similar ; for if they had, all the low simoniacal practices which have disfigured the portraiture of both churches would have been avoided, and all the nepotism of the one church, and the filism of the other ; the self-seeking appointments of incompetent, unlearned, and ungodly men ; the making of the church a warm nest for cousins, family connexions and followers ; the fitting of the benefice to the man, and not the man to the benefice ; all these monstrous evils would have been obviated, and religion, wounded through the sides of its ministers, would not have become the scorn of the scoffer, and her state the object of grief and shame to all who are alive to her best interests.

* The Rev. L. Morrissey, to whom we are indebted for the above statement respecting the mode of collating to benefices, required by the Council of Trent, was parish priest of Ouing and Templeorum, in the diocese of Ossory. For being what is called a Protestant priest—that is to say, for occasionally associating with Protestants, and preaching up loyalty and obedience to the laws—he was persecuted, and driven from his parish ; and when subsequently appointed, as he well-deserved, Roman Catholic Chaplain to the gaol of Newgate, in Dublin, even there the Romish hierarchy did not cease to persecute him. Accordingly, in defence of his character, he pub-

The synodical election of bishops has, for the last two centuries, fallen into disuse; and though the Pope now nominally,

lished two successive volumes, entitled, "A Development of the Cruel and Dangerous Inquisitorial System of the Court of Rome in Ireland." There is a great deal of information in these volumes, and it is a pity the Protestant public are not more acquainted with them. We can assure them the disclosures are nearly as startling as those of Father Croly. Take, for instance, the following, with respect to confession:

"The general opinion of Roman Catholics is, that priests do not think of, or recollect the sins they hear in confession, and much less talk of and relate them to others: but, with the greatest regret, I can assert the contrary, and prove the fact. The dispensations of the Spanish tribunals, and the instructions issued to European and American confessors, should suffice to prove and demonstrate the reality of sacramental disclosures, and sacramental abuses: however, as foreign examples will not always convince the Irish, without quoting some recent and domestic instances impressive of credulity, I shall unquestionably put the subject matter beyond all doubts of probability. Some lay people informed me, that they heard several priests, in company, relating some sins of a delicate nature, of which said clergy acquired knowledge in the confessional, under the seal of that sacred tribunal, at which they were greatly scandalized, but had not fortitude enough to reprimand, or sufficient knowledge to report them to their superiors, who ought to suspend them perpetually from their office. I have been myself present in company, at different times, where I witnessed priests revealing heinous sins sacramentally confessed to them. Some priests informed me (extra) without the least necessity, of most enormous crimes they heard in confession, perpetrated between * * * *

"In fact, several priests vie at times among themselves, to know which of them could relate and inform each other of the greatest and most odious sins, communicated to them in the *sacred confidential tribunal*. They take secret pride in having it in their power to make such communications. A bishop informed me of the sins one of his penitents told him in confession, who was a respectable lady, and an acquaintance of mine. He even mentioned her name. Some coolness existed between a certain priest and myself, to whom I was in the habit of going to confession previous to our misunderstanding; in the course of some time after, he revealed my sacramental confession to others in my presence. I have been often an ocular witness to the abuses, licentiousness, and improper conduct of several clergymen in the confessional, who, in the place of healing and reconciling sinners to God, inflicted deep wounds both on their own souls, and those of their penitents.

* * * Converting the tribunal of forgiveness and reconciliation into that of binding and ensnaring—of grief and sorrow, into that of base pleasure and filthy lucre. It is, alas! become a mutual repository of vice and profanation—a mutual depravity and corruption among many. It is a most delicate, precarious, and dangerous adventure for any person to open his mind and disclose the secrets of his heart, and entrust his soul and eternal welfare into the hands of many priests. *If the truth was known, at least one half of them would be idle, until a thorough change and reformation would take place. Shall I be more explicit? Ah! I shudder at the idea!*"

Alluding to the degraded state of the parish priests, and their double subserviency to their bishops and their flocks—fearful of banishment by the former, of starvation from the latter—he thus observes:

"How many Roman Catholics, clergy and laity, will disavow and reprobate these inquisitorial principles, disobey their spiritual superiors, and suffer

the bench of Irish prelates virtually appoints to the vacant bishoprics; and this hierarchy exists as a close, a powerful, and if

the privation of all sacred rites, divine institutions, and temporal properties, rather than cooperate in the perpetration of such infamous crimes and intolerant measures? I answer: as many as will prefer religion to human interest, the voice of heaven to contradictory and cruel edicts, the dictates of reason to hoodwinked obedience; and reprobate the cruel system in public and private, abet and applaud every salutary measure adopted to destroy its existence, and prevent future recurrences—I say those, and no more. How many priests will oppose their spiritual guides, and refuse to cooperate in the execution of horrible laws and treasonable practices, devised and enacted against the lives and properties of honest and upright men, true Christians, and fellow-citizens; in a word, against the king and constitution?—I say, all those who shall unfeignedly preach loyalty in its full extent; who will inveigh against all illegal constitutions, treasonable oaths, and irreligious pursuits—who will inculcate the absolute necessity of obeying God before men; rejecting and despising all commands and injunctions enjoined by popes, bishops, and priests, contrary to the state, contrary to religion, reason, and justice; who shall confer sacraments, and administer spiritual consolation to all; who will oppose and condemn the nefarious system and treacherous principles established by the promoters and ministers of the alarming and malignant inquisition, and shall withdraw them from all who should abet and encourage that detestable scheme—I say, all those, and no more. How many clergymen can be considered loyal and faithful? All those who shall independently act as above, and no more. How many, on the contrary, can be justly and strictly considered disloyal and unfaithful? All those who will not act according to the principles now laid down. The former should be encouraged and made independent, and the latter watched and circumscribed by prohibitive restrictions. Draw a line of discrimination between the conformists and nonconformists, loyalists and nonloyalists, and you will necessarily conclude with St. Gregory, ‘*Multi sacerdotes, pauci sacerdotes; multi nomine, pauci opere.*’ ‘Many priests, few priests; many in name, but few in reality.’ And I may add, ‘*Multi inquisitores, pauci fideles.*’ ‘Many inquisitors, but few loyalists.’”

And again, with regard to the exaction of dues, he thus discloses:

“There are two things by which parochial dues are regulated, and can be justly demanded, viz. custom, accompanied by certain conditions, and sanctioned by the superior of the diocese; and secondly, diocesan statutes, by which the sum to be demanded is determined. The first was not established in the diocese of Ossory, as Doctor Lanigan, a little before this time, prohibited his clergy to exact any retributions from their parishioners beyond the stipulated dues; and said, ‘if they did, they would be strictly bound to restitution for the overplus.’ I called different times on my superiors for these statutes; some told me they could not find them among their papers; some more said they had lost them, and desired I should apply to some of the parish priests, who had them in their possession. I enquired, and could not procure them by any chance; therefore, I had no other criterion to be guided by, but the general custom practised by those who read them, and knew their contents; and for the safety of my conscience, I generally charged my people less than they did. The parish clergymen were and are strictly bound in conscience, and justice, to inform their flocks of the nature and amount of the parochial dues regulated by said statutes, in order that their parishioners might know what to give, and also prevent the extortion of avaricious priests. Notwithstanding, the people were kept in ignorance,

disaffected, which it but too often has been, a dangerous corporation in the state, an "*imperium in imperio*." But this is not

for the base purpose of extorting more than the diocesan statutes allowed. In order to make a defence against the malicious attack now specified, and also to know how much I might expect and ask, I made further inquiries, and at length, by verbal information, came to the knowledge of these regulations respecting the parochial dues. Then I announced and explained said statutes to my flock, conformably to my bounden duty, and informed them that no more could be demanded, or received by any priest, except voluntarily offered. The clergy in general felt indignant at this exposure of their past injustices and extortion, and were enraged at this promulgation, which might justly prevent future impositions, and cause a reduction in extraordinary demands. To prove the fact, I shall quote an instance which happened at the interment of one of my neighbouring parish priests, the Rev. Mr. Fitzpatrick, of Mounooyna. I went, according to custom and usage, to pray for, and officiate at the funeral obsequies of this worthy man, who was a rare *avis* among the priests. I was peremptorily prevented from officiating by the clergyman there; I was pointed out as a rotten sheep among the holy inquisitors, and was insulted by one of them in particular, (a near relative of the deceased,) for the promulgation of the diocesan statutes."

Speaking of the despotism of the Romish bishops, he says:

"The state of fluctuation, ignorance, and misery in which Ireland is plunged, is owing to the *artfulness of bishops*, indolence of the clergy, and passive forbearance of the English government. The prelates desisted from holding provincial councils and diocesan synods; the election of bishops by dean and chapter, or by the clergy in general, and canonical collations by canonical concursus; by these ecclesiastical laws, their authority was restrained within its proper limits, and their episcopal administration regulated by the hand of justice, by clerical and civil interference; but as soon as these restraints were removed, the prelates monopolized what was not their own, and usurped the authority which was invested in the clergy and laity, in order to promote their friends and faithful inquisitors to ecclesiastical preferments, for the accomplishment of treasonable practices, and ultimate ruin of loyal subjects. The Irish clergy tamely yielded to the usurpation of their rights, and thereby lost their own jurisdiction and power, and consequently are now completely unhinged in their ecclesiastical livings, ecclesiastical rights, and temporal emoluments; and are, unquestionably, at the mere disposal and volatile disposition of aspiring superiors and oppressive ministers. *Now the bishops laugh at both clergy and laity.*"

Again, speaking of the way in which the bishops exercise the patronage they have usurped:

"What is more common than to promote young clergymen to livings before old curates; *ignorant and dumb dogs*, before learned and zealous priests; cringing sycophants, friends and relatives, before men of candour, religion, and merit. The disappointed and insulted coadjutors could insist on the establishment of a concursus where the council of Trent is received. They could insist on just and equitable promotions where it is not received. They could not be opposed, or, at least, refused, in claiming justice, and preventing the usurpation of their rights. What a dreadful account must prelates render another day, for the abolition of the salutary laws of the church, viz., deans and chapters, councils and synods, vicar-generals, concursus, &c. I am not astonished at what the great Alban Butler has said, in his posthumous works. *In my opinion, said he, there will be but few*

the only change for the worse that has taken place; a still more important alteration has occurred in the mode of appointing

bishops saved. Any man who doubts the assertion, let him compare their lives and works, with the lives and works of the Apostles, their zeal and piety, with the zeal and piety of the ancient fathers, their inquisitorial laws, with the laws of the Gospel; and then let him candidly declare whether he will coincide in opinion with *Alban Butler*."

With regard to a provision for the Roman priests, Father Morrissey coincides with his brother Croly, as will be seen from the following extracts:

"There are twenty-six dioceses in Ireland, besides the wardenship of Galway; in each diocese there are from thirty to forty parishes in general, and each parish is, on an average, worth some hundreds of pounds: the entire accumulate to a very large amount. Although this vast sum is considered the voluntary contributions of the people, it is, properly speaking, the property of the subject, and often enforced by virtue of diocesan statutes, and avarice of pastors, against the free will of the people. *This large property is at the mere will and disposal of the bishops*, for the purpose of supporting the influence of foreign power, and their own dominion over the minds and morals of priests and laity. This property they can give and take away again without any control, and thus keep the priests enslaved, and as instruments in their hands, to achieve their designs and execute their plans. This property of the subject is often applied against the welfare of the state, and tranquillity of the country. These unhappy effects will always follow from the present system of managing parochial emoluments, of conferring and depriving again of ecclesiastical benefices, and keeping the clergy enthralled in a state of suspense and perpetual uncertainty, until the government shall take the management of this property, and disposal of the benefices and appointments of the clergy to ecclesiastical preferments, into their own hands exclusively. This is the practice in other countries."

"Let us now consider the doleful condition and dangerous predicament of the Irish priests!! They have no political protection against the intrigues of a foreign court; they have no civil or ecclesiastical remedy against the tyranny and oppression of spiritual superiors: they have no fixed or permanent property from the *foreign power they are enslaved to*: they have no tie, according to the present system, of the benefices they hold; in short, they are like aliens, without a stake or property either in church or state, at home or abroad. What then can be expected from men of feelings and men of knowledge thus situated, thus isolated? May I relate the inclination of the human mind by the veracity of human events?

"They would wish for a Roman Catholic monarch, who would restore their glebes and church-livings, or at least secure their benefices and ecclesiastical preferments, by civil interference and coercive measures; who would protect their honour and reputation by legal investigations in the ecclesiastical courts. They would aid and assist the accomplishment of that object, without scruple or remorse of conscience, whilst they despair of any amelioration of their present condition. For they say, 'why should we be faithful to those who would not secure our livings, and protect our honour against tyranny and calumny? Why should we prevent the misfortunes and downfall of those, who see ours, and would not apply a remedy, and make the necessary laws that would secure themselves, and protect us; whereby treasonable plots and dangerous machinations would be discovered, and hidden things brought to light? Let the law be made in our favour, and we shall act in favour of our king and country.'"

parish priests. We have already shown, how the disciplinary canon of the council of Trent has directed that their collation should take place. But it is a curious fact, that these canons are not universally received in Ireland, by a strange anomaly, that the church that boasts so much of her unity, even in our small island, should exhibit so much discrepancy; and so we find the decrees of this FINAL COUNCIL nominally recognized in Munster, Ulster, and Connaught, but rejected in Leinster. In the three first-named provinces priests were formerly collated conformably to the Trent canon; and accordingly they could not, by any episcopal mandate, be removed. Married to their parishes, no man could put them asunder, save for disabilities for which the ecclesiastical law had provided. Some of the old priests are still in this safe state, and we happen to know some quiet, punch-loving, peace-loving priests, who bless their stars that they were collated according to the old, but now obsolete canon of Trent, and that the bishop dare not translate them, or de-

"The only thing left for the establishment of this necessary law is, to make the *act*, and leave every man at his own discretion to embrace or reject it; then, and only then, can the loyal and disloyal priest be known, as his fears and apprehensions of ecclesiastical censures and spoiliations would be happily removed by such a statute. It is then the faithful clergyman could, with impunity, preach up true loyalty, and reprobate all inquisitorial schemes, and disavow all foreign claims; it is then the people could be enlightened, and prejudices removed; it is then the great influence of the Roman Catholic clergymen and the executive power, would become an everlasting consolidation against the united combinations of foreign power and domestic enemies. There is no other resource or alternative for reconciling and attaching the clergy to the crown, or for bringing the people (through the medium of clerical influence) to a sense of true fidelity and due subordination. Let the change be first wrought in the clergy, by the adoption of this *act*, which will make a legal provision for their support, that cannot be taken away from them by episcopal tyranny and clerical treachery; that will secure their honour, and support their independence; and then a change in the people will inevitably follow; otherwise, all attempts for effecting a reconciliation and reformation will be in vain."

"If King George IV. would resume his right, and appoint his Roman Catholic clergymen to their respective benefices, and secure their livings under his *paternal* protection, they would now advise and assist him against the intrigues of foreign power and episcopal influence, as the clergy did King Edward before. Until this measure be adopted, no man will ever see Ireland quiet, the life of the proper and loyal subject will not be secured, or his property safe. For similar reasons the King of France reserved the collation of benefices to himself, in the fourteenth century."

One might suppose that what was stated by two such competent testimonies as Fathers Morrissey and Croly—and before we have done with this article we shall be able to adduce other testimonies—would convince even the most *liberal*, that the unhappy state of Ireland was owing to the peculiar influence of the Romish hierarchy and priesthood. But who or what could open the eyes of a party man?

prive them : but with others it is not so. By an arrangement with those at Rome who have the management of Irish affairs, all recently appointed as parish priests are treated and considered like the priests of England or America ; as missionaries, who have but a roving commission, and who may, many much against their wills, be removed from their downy beds in one parish, to much harder sleeping berths in another ; who must be packing whenever their bishop says, go : and who are in a state of rest or unrest "*ad libitum superiorum.*" The great majority, then, of the working clergy of the Romish church in Ireland, have no right, as Father Morissy well says, to the title of parish priests. That term, in ancient times, involved the idea of permanence, immunity, and independence ; but now, those who discharge priestly functions in the parishes of Ireland are double slaves, paying service to their bishops and to their flocks, under the terror of most inconvenient removal by the one, and of starvation from the other. We cannot imagine any system better calculated, except that of a Maynooth education, to create a cunning, time-serving, low-minded, sycophantic, truckling clergy, than the one to which the Popish priests in Ireland are now subjected.

The Romish priests of Ireland are subjected, then, to all the evils arising from the faults of two opposite systems ; they are submitted to the hierarchal despotism which may grow out of an established and episcopal church, and to the still more degrading subjection which is connected with the voluntary system of dissenting congregations. Pleasing to live, they must live to please ; and so, finding the people disaffected to the British connexion, they have had the worldly prudence to perceive that they could best gratify their flocks, and keep them in a *paying* temper, by laying corrosives on the sore, by keeping open the *RAW* that was established ; and so their dues have been secured, their influence has been confirmed, their order sanctified, by keeping the population in a hot, angry, and hating state, with respect to England—the public mind morbid with the recollection of past wrongs, and with the determination, which no calculation of probabilities can check, of recovering *forfeited* property, and religious *ascendancy*.

But this bias towards disaffection which the parish clergy have impressed on the people would not, and could not, have had the lamentable effects which have accrued, and are still operating, were not the three or four thousand parish priests brought under subserviency, and compelled to unity of action, by an *OLIGARCHY OF PRELATES*. Doubtless the parochial *TRIBUNES OF THE PEOPLE* would not have acted as with one mind, had they not been controlled by the *EXECUTIVE DIRECTORY* of the hierarchy. And here, we think, we perceive the *danger* of Ireland with respect to the character of political Popery, and the *safety* of England with respect to political dissenterism. The two-edged sword, that has got its commission to go through *OUR* land, may have its handle so far off as Rome ; it may be put now into the hands of an

O'Connell; it may be put hereafter into the hands of some future Bonaparte; but the dissenters in England, with all their acrimony, and all their brawling, and all their individual bravery, are but a heterogeneous conglomerate, that never can be fused together so as to form a solid bullet to batter down the Church of England.

Let us, before we touch specifically on Mr. Croly's statements, as briefly as possible prove historically our position, that the disaffected state of Ireland has been owing to the peculiar character of the Romish priesthood; and that, if Ireland has proved a source of weakness instead of strength—if her diseased state has baffled the skill of every statesman, from the days of Elizabeth to those of William the Fourth, and confounded the best hopes and intentions of every minister, from a Lord Burleigh to a Lord Grey, it is owing to the power, the position, shall we say the necessities, of the parish clergy.

The Rev. Charles O'Connor, in his *Letters of Columbanus*, has well remarked, and Mr. Croly has repeated the assertion, that Elizabeth having broken down the power of the Irish chieftains, the people, accustomed to dependence of some sort, cast themselves at the feet of the clergy, who, under foreign influence, intrigued from that day forth to keep up the turbulent disaffected spirit that they found existing, and to that purpose they brought spiritual means and temporal hopes alike to bear, to promote agitation.* In the midst of that prosperity which the peaceable

* Routh, Roman Catholic Bishop of Ossory, in his "*Analecta Sacra*," put forward the claims of the Romish clergy on the people as follows: "Thus, in this most afflicted kingdom of Ireland, bath God preserved the seeds of that pure and divine religion which it received from the ministry of the Roman Church, so that all may perceive how it might flourish in earthly peace and prosperity, if the sons of God (i. e. the priests) were permitted so to instruct the children of men (i. e. the people), that while they especially loved the tents of Israel, they yet should not despise the tabernacles of Jacob. And since the authority of the teachers is the great attraction to learning and good discipline, it appeareth that no more effective education can be devised for bringing this people unto all civil duties, and the rules of government and society, than to place them, according to their own choice and affection, in the hands of the Catholic priesthood. No more expedient course can be devised for subduing this nation, and keeping it firmly in due allegiance, than to have the people instructed by those teachers whose good will to them is beyond suspicion, whose devotion to God and fidelity to the king are also well known. By such a mode of government they will be more inclined to obedience, than by armed soldiers or sanguinary edicts of parliament. Our rustics themselves declare that they are deterred from murder, revenge, robbery, or other violence, more by the censures of the priest than the sentence of the secular judge; that they are more afraid of an ecclesiastical interdict than a royal proclamation—of suspension from the rites of the church than of imprisonment or hanging. If, then, we were allowed to exercise those powers which the sacred councils and canons do grant us, against rebellious and seditious folk, we should use all diligence that they were vigorously executed: if not, we will permit that the offender be punished by the civil magistrate." Let the sad story of 300 years tell whether the power that Routh claimed for the clergy has been exercised to effect the good he promised.—ED.

views of James the First fostered in Ireland, and which had begun to have the happiest effects on a country so fertile and so full of resources, the priests set to work to counteract the policy of the state and the blessings of Providence; and so ready were the people to give ear to them, that when Father M'Crodden declared, in his sermon, at the Glynn, in Maguire's country, May, 1613, that O'Neal was coming with an army of 1800 men, they kissed his garments, and made a collection for him of 2,000 cows. Ebber M'Mahon, the Romish bishop of Clogher, confessed to Sir George Radcliff, in 1634, seven years before the great rebellion, that he had been for several years concerting measures for an insurrection. The priests and friars concocted the plan and practice of that rebellion, in conclave, at the abbey of Multifernam, in Westmeath; there they, under the auspices of Cardinal Richlieu, formed a holy *league*, like that of Guise's against the Hugonots; and, as O'Connor says, "the massacre of St. Bartholomew went through a second edition in Ireland."* In the course of that sanguinary and singular rebellion, when four parties struggled for the superiority, it is highly probable that if the Roman Catholic gentry who had joined the rebellion, and who certainly propounded good measures for Ireland in their assembly at Kilkenny, had been let to proceed as they desired, Ireland had been saved from the curse of Cromwell and the penal laws, and Charles the First's head would not have come to the block. But the clergy interfered; they allied themselves with the rabble, and from the rabble they acquired such an ascendancy, that they overthrew the plan of the nobility and gentry. Some of the most virtuous patriots they imprisoned; they excommunicated the worthy clergymen of their own communion who disapproved of their measures; they were, as O'Connor says, "confederated with the Creaghts, the Ulster murderers, whose fingers were smeared with blood, and whose proceedings, by the Nuncio's own account, were marked by every species of savage cruelty." Thus, as the same eloquent and indignant writer observes,

"A country temperate in climate, fertile in soil, abounding in population, rich in animal and mineral productions; situated in an advanced position between the new and old world, and destined by nature as a depot of both; intersected by deep, navigable rivers, lakes, and spacious inlets of the sea extending far into the land; inhabited by a brave, enterprising, and generous people, who are possessed of strong mental and bodily powers, was, notwithstanding all these advantages, conquered by the intrigues of a Roman courtier, and of eighteen or nineteen bishops, who conspired with him against

* Lord Castlehaven says, "That the councils of Spain and Rome, the Irish monasteries and seminaries in so many countries, and very many of the characters returning out of them, and chiefly the titular bishops, took an effectual course, under the colour of religion, to add continually more fuel to the burning coals."

their oaths, against their country, against their landlords and ancient masters, to whose kitchens many of them were indebted for subsistence in their younger years, and to whose generosity they were indebted for their education, looking confidently to the pomp of parliamentary elevation in the state, as well as of full and unrestrained jurisdiction in the church. One was my Lord of Ross, another my Lord of Cashel, &c. &c.; and the Irish soldiers, who supported their mockery of dominion, now styled the Nuncio's soldiers, were placed under the peculiar protection of the Holy See."

The disaffected clergy then had their own way; they persecuted and excommunicated every bishop or priest who opposed their views; they first chased the Protestant Ormond, and subsequently the Roman Catholic Clanricarde from the government of the kingdom; they offered the sovereignty of the island to a foreign Papist; and then they gave way and sunk, amidst their own intrigues and intestine dissensions, before the sword of Cromwell, who walked as a conqueror and confiscator over the length and breadth of the land. But, in due time, the restoration of the Stuarts came about, and all popish eyes were lifted towards the royal countenance, as expecting from a prince, who was all but a Romanist, that aid, in their abasement and distress, which they had reason to expect. They therefore, to show their loyalty, and in hopes of mitigating the severe laws made against them by the puritans, and of recovering, in part at least, some portion of the immense properties that had been confiscated, agreed upon a protestation of their loyalty, entitled the Roman Catholic Loyal Remonstrance. This paper was couched in the most explicit terms, and it separated the temporal allegiance which they owed to their king from the spiritual they owed to their pope; and they declared that they were desirous to give unto Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's, and unto the church the things that were the church's. This document, signed by sixty-nine of the clergy, by five earls, six viscounts, two barons, twenty-four colonels and baronets, and sixty esquires, was brought over to London by Lord Fingall, and committed to the Rev. Peter Walsh, a Franciscan friar, who was much in the confidence of the Duke of Ormond. When placed in the Duke's hands, preparatory to its being presented to the king, it was objected to by him, who knew so well the deep things of Popery, as not signed by the *whole body* of the clergy,—and he was right. It emanated, in fact, but from the loyalty, the fears, the hopes of the nobility, gentry, and a few patriot clergymen. But when the Court of Rome heard of this REMONSTRANCE, which was couched in the very terms of the oath of allegiance taken by the English Roman Catholics, there came over a loud fulmination against it. All the clergy who had affixed their names to it were deprived and cursed; and by their mild Pope Alexander the Seventh, were condemned to be whipt on the bare back, before they could be absolved from the "*Excommunicatio Major Latæ Sententiæ*," which they had incurred by adopting it; deprived of their livings, disqualified from all priestly functions,

forewarned that they should be denied Christian burial when dead, and summoned to appear before foreign courts of inquisition, invested with a power of inflicting perpetual banishment and death. In this way, and for this cause, some of the best and holiest Roman Catholic clergy that ever Ireland saw—Walsh, Caro, Coppinger, Lynch, &c. &c.—were brought *under penal laws in the name of God*, for no other crime than a steady loyalty, which, as they said themselves, their religion positively enjoined.

The consequence of the Irish clergy's rejection of the Loyal Remonstrance, placed not only the Roman Catholic nobility and gentry, but also the newly restored king in a very unpleasant predicament. It is more than probable that had Charles been fortified by this declaration of *universal* repentance for past misdeeds and of future loyalty, he would have been able to have so arranged the Act of Settlement as to have restored to the ejected Roman Catholic proprietors a large portion of their lands. But the clergy stood in the way; and as they heretofore paved the way for the conquest of Ireland by Cromwell, so now by their submission to foreign influence, they confirmed the Cromwellian soldiers in the possession of their new properties. Charles, therefore, and his popish courtiers, however they might nibble at, and tear off small portions of the forfeited grants, yet could not, to any extent, overdraw the Act of Settlement. The clergy, in thus sacrificing the best interests of the laity, had recourse to their "*Patrias Artes*," their ready cut-and-dry machinery; and therefore they set up a *THAUMATURGOS*, a wonder-worker in the person of a Father Finacht, who went about Ireland confirming the people in their attachment to their clergy, and in their submission to all the commands that came from Rome. It is, perhaps needless to state, that, though Peter Walsh, and others, amply exposed this imposter, he served the turn for which he was wanted. The clergy knew they had a brutified populace to deal with, and they treated them as beasts but made to carry their burdens. It is not our intention to enlarge on the war of the Revolution, or expose the deep and bitter intolerance which the Romish clergy manifested on this occasion. Neither can we speak as largely as we could wish on the consequence of the enactment of the penal laws; laws which the Protestant laity called for more than the clergy; laws demanded by the *fears* of those who held forfeited property—by the wrath of those who saw the bitter persecution of the French Protestants; laws which, as contrary to the spirit of Protestantism and the character of Britons, were never to any extent put in force—so much was this the case, that while the French Protestants, under the rigorous execution of the French penal laws, were all but exterminated, the Irish Roman Catholics actually increased, grew rich and insolent, and their hierarchy, as archbishops, bishops, and vicars-general, exercised full ecclesiastical jurisdiction throughout the kingdom. The truth is, that public opinion so neutralized the effect of the penal laws, that Popery flourished and fostered itself in Ireland through

their means. No Protestant dare put in force any of the *revolting* enactments of this detestable code, without being hooted at by his neighbours; and the Protestant clergy, fortified as they thought they were by the king's bayonets, cast aside the sword of the spirit, ceased to go forth with the word of God in their hands, and tacitly gave up the charge that was solemnly committed to them, of looking after the Roman Catholic portion of their flocks; inasmuch as any attempt to interfere with them might be considered as an infringement on the point of honour which almost all Protestants held, of leaving unmolested what the hands of the law had so severely touched. And so Popery flourished, as a religion, under the shade of the penal laws; nay, more, the Popish people increased in riches as well as in number—protected by the sword, suspended, but never unsheathed, of the penal laws, from the evil effects of their own agitations. We think we are borne out in our assertions by the voice of history, that never since the day when Milesius landed as the curse of Ireland, did the island enjoy such peace and daily increasing prosperity as during the existence of the penal laws. In the very central period of their existence, we find the Irish Protestant gentry, who, at night, over their cups, were in the habit of toasting the memory of Old Noll and King William, who had saved them from Popery, slavery, brass money, and wooden shoes, the next morning ejecting a Protestant tenant to admit a popish; and by every means in their power destroying the influence and the agency of Protestantism, by not only exhibiting in their own lives the most ungodly practices, but by every avaricious expedient cutting down the incomes of their own clergy.

(To be concluded in the Supplement.)

ON THE RECOVERY OF TITHE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—In the year 1832, I published a letter, addressed to Mr. Stanley, and on looking it over I find the following passage: "The ministers of the Gospel are placed in the foremost rank, to fight the battles of property, and to bear the first shock of every assault against it. Their inheritance lies between the two great contending powers, and is consequently the continual seat of war. Every battle which takes place between the possessors of property, and the assailers of property, is fought upon what ought to be a peaceful and hallowed enclosure. Whenever the country is disturbed, all eyes are upon the clergy: some vilifying them as extortioners, and others cheering them onward to the fight."

I would ask whether present appearances, in the year 1834, do not amply verify this description? And I would add, in the words which immediately follow in that letter, "Is not this a most revolting and unnatural state of things? Is it not calculated to render the clergy odious to the poor? Is not such a system likely to identify them with all that is worldly, in the calculations of the rich? And can any thing be conceived less favorable to that character of mind, which befits the calling of the clergyman himself?"

The present posture of affairs places a considerable proportion of the clergy in a very unfair position. Some able, and, I doubt not, well-intentioned members of our body have taken so great a lead in general meetings, and offered themselves so much to public notice, that it seems taken for granted, by both the friends and opposers of the government, that these individuals speak the sense, and are virtually the representatives of the whole clergy. But the truth of the case is, I believe, widely different. I can answer at least for one, and say, that much as I respect the talents and intentions of the persons in question, I am compelled to dissent altogether from their views, and to doubt the wisdom of the course they have of late pursued. As a politician I do not take upon me to speak. Were the subject merely of a political nature, it would be great presumption in me to engage in an unequal contest with men so eminently my superiors. But I cannot view a matter which respects the church, and the character of its ministers as altogether a political consideration. Whatever may be the constitutional bearings of the question; whether the legislature is justifiable or not in new-modelling, or in diminishing ecclesiastical property, I leave to those whom Providence has called to preside over, or to "intermeddle with" such matters. Nay, I should consider it as best befitting me to be silent, even upon the religious considerations which the present subject involves, were it not

that I feel it to be injustice to myself, and to those of my brethren who entertain congenial sentiments, to have imputed to us opinions which are not only contrary to our judgment, but in direct opposition to what we hold in conscience, as ministers of the Gospel.

The general persuasion then, I repeat it, is, that the clergy *are agreed* in resisting, as far as they can, any plan which government may have in view to interfere with the property of the church; that it is, at least, the sense of the body, that it is better to uphold the present system than to submit to any material diminution of their incomes; or that, at all events, tithe and composition are preferable to any arrangement which would make them pensioners on the State. Now, viewing tithe and composition in the light I do, I could not conscientiously subscribe to any one of these three positions; and I claim it as my fair right not to be misunderstood, or, without my own consent, to be considered as one of a party whose sentiments are in the very extreme of opposition to what I am firmly and conscientiously persuaded of. Whatever the laity who hold what are called conservative principles may feel to be their duty, I think the clergy should unite in presenting one, and but one, petition to the legislature, and that is, that whatever arrangements they make of clerical property in other respects, they will free the clergy from those painful embarrassments, in which any possible modification of the tithe system must ever place them. I am more and more persuaded that tithe has been the great obstacle to the spread of Protestantism, and the diffusion of true religion amongst the people of this country. I have spent a long life in Ireland, and most of it in close connection with the clergy; and I can bear my testimony, that since the earliest period of my recollection, tithe has been the fruitful source of litigation, violence, and hatred. Whatever the theory of the case may be, this has been the practical result. It may be ever so true that no man, strictly speaking, pays tithe at all; or that if any does pay tithe, it is virtually the landlord, and not the tenant. But what avails all this, if the poor man thinks and feels that it is he who pays it?

It is the principle of all wise taxation to raise the revenues required in modes as little perceptible and as little invidious as can be devised. How unfortunate, then, is it that if tithe be in reality paid by none; or, at least, if it be paid by the wealthy alone, it should have the appearance of coming in such large proportions from the poor! How unfortunate is it that if it be in its nature a claim upon the land antecedent to that of the Protestant landlord, it should look so like a charge on the industry of the Roman Catholic tenant! But it is useless to enlarge upon such points, because it will be said that composition has materially improved all this. Has composition, however, so remedied the evil as to place the clergyman on such a footing as can be satisfactory to his feelings, as a lover of peace, and a minister of the Gospel? How

does he stand at this moment as it respects his Roman Catholic parishioners? Do not the church and that large proportion of the population seem like two hostile armies just on the point of commencing operations, and rushing to an onset, at which the peaceful Christian shudders? How is the minister placed in many parishes in relation to the members of his own flock in general? I have myself heard clergymen declare that such is the unhappy effect of the system I deplore, that it is often a relief to them to think that most of their parishioners are Romanists; that they may not be wounded in the house of their friends, and meet in church reproachful looks and alienated hearts. What is the state of things moreover, at this instant, between the clergyman and the leading gentry of the country? In many instances nothing can be more painful. What selfishness, what littleness, what base desertion of the church to which they make profession of belonging, and of its ministers of whom they are the natural protectors, do numbers of our gentry too palpably evince! In this respect I will venture to say that our men of fortune, as a body, whatever counterbalancing qualities they may possess, have less zeal for the external maintenance of their religion, than any other class of Christians in the empire. It is easier to raise funds for such purposes out of the poverty of other churches than out of the riches of our own. If it be considered that about nine-tenths of the landed property of Ireland, belong to members of the Church of England, and that not more than one-sixth of the population is of that persuasion, how handsomely ought its ministers to be provided for, though there were no establishment at all! While but one-tenth of the landed property is in the hands of those who nevertheless secure a decent maintenance to the spiritual ministers of five-sixths of the people, how abundantly, I repeat it, should our clergy, even if there were no legal provision, be paid and overpaid, if the zeal of our gentry were half as warm as that which animates every other body. And yet so it is that in a great proportion of instances the Protestant clergyman finds the Protestant gentleman yielding with reluctance what the law obliges him to pay; and, though possessed of power and influence in the country, standing by and leaving his own pastor to struggle as he may, amidst difficulties, dangers, and distresses.

These are trials to flesh and blood. It is true the pious clergyman may find relief in the consolations of religion, and be cheered by the sympathies of the few who take a real interest in his concerns. But still he cannot be insensible to these trials. Nay, at times, he will be tempted to feel that all are in confederacy against him. Not only Roman Catholics, but the members of his own flock; not only the lower classes, but the most influential of the gentry, will present themselves in such an attitude to his mind, as if selfishness was the only principle on which men could act. Now, depraved as society may be, it is not come to this. Take the average of our parishes, and they are not

composed of such base materials. There must be then something fundamentally bad in a system which can act thus unfavourably on the characters of men; which can gather round it and stimulate into action whatever is worst, and all that is disingenuous, in those who come within the sphere of its operation. There must be something deplorable in a system which forces the professed minister of reconciliation into ceaseless collision with the basest passions of those around him; which leaves him no choice but that of relinquishing, what he often considers it a sacred trust, and duty to defend; or, by endless contests about money, of fanning the flame of covetousness, and blowing up the fires of discord in those very bosoms, which it is his office to fill and to warm with every high, and generous, and holy sentiment. . Yes, it is to the system, and to nothing which distinguishes tithe-payers from other men, that this otherwise unaccountable conduct, to the clergyman, is to be attributed. And what proves it is, that persons, in every other respect, just, and liberal, and humane, will in that single instance, seem to change their nature. Where one would expect the hearts of such men to be most accessible, there and there alone, they are closed and hardened. Men who are ready to relieve distress, or to promote any scheme of public interest and utility, will see the house in which they worship God dilapidating, its roof decaying, its windows broken; all presenting a shameful contrast to the popish chapel, or dissenting meeting-house adjoining; nay, as if here alone they could not feel, instead of rallying round the man from whom they receive the sacrament, and whose consolations they will call for, at a dying hour, when run down and persecuted, they will "pass by on the other side," or think it enough tardily to send him, what they cannot, without resistance to the law, withhold. Now, what can account for this inconsistency, this contrast which even a good man sometimes exhibits in this respect, to himself and to his uniform deportment in other matters? It must be the badness of the system. In the same way it is that Popery in nothing so manifestly shows the spirit it is of, as in its power of leading the best men to perform the worst actions. The friends of that communion are fond of saying, "Can our church be so corrupt as you represent, when so many godly men have been its members?" I grant that the church of Rome has had its saints; men of heavenly tempers, and holy conversation. But I say, that in some respects, these very men have been her shame. For what but some deep mystery of evil in the system, could convert a Fenelon into a slavish bigot, or a Francis de Sales into an advocate of persecution? Yet so it was. And many are the instances of those who, as men, and private Christians, were near to angels, and yet who, as churchmen and Romanists, were next to devils. Many a leading member of that communion, has left a closet where he had daily poured forth the incense of his prayers to God, to take his seat in a synod, or assembly where he gave his voice, and thought it his duty, to commit his

fellow-creatures to the flames. This shows what bad systems can do with good men.

Nothing, then, can argue more unfavourably for tithe, than the ill-effects it has the power of producing on upright, and liberal minds. The fact is, that our laity are, if it is not almost ludicrous to say so, so used to see their clergy embarrassed, and in jeopardy, that they have lost the sense of feeling for them. Besides, the custom of considering tithe or arrangements of composition as matters where the part of the clergyman is to strive for all he can, and of the parishioners to yield as little as they can, forms an association in the mind between the church and church encroachment, which throws laymen on the defensive, and induces an inveterate habit of illiberality in all things pertaining to religious uses, which, I contend, is to be found in individuals who are illiberal in no other instance. It is my firm persuasion that if tithe were not objectionable on any account besides, it would be so on the sole ground of its laying a snare for the consciences of laymen. Whatever tempts or whatever accustoms any man to act in any instance as he ought not to act, is to him an occasion of sin. Is this, then, a consideration of small account with those whose office it is to convert the sinner from the error of his ways?

The ill effects of money transactions upon the private ministrations of the parochial pastor, I have endeavoured to set forth in my letter to Mr. Stanley. I shall not therefore insist upon that topic here. I shall only advert to the hindrances which they present to the comfortable performance of his public duties in the church. Do not tithe and composition often place a minister upon awkward and jealous terms with those before whom he officiates in that house of prayer? And is it not understood, of course between the parties, that money, and money as a thing valued, nay, so valued as to be thought worth the risking or diminishing cordiality between the pastor and his flock, is the matter at issue, and in dispute? Now, I appeal to any clergyman who would approve himself to men's consciences, and win their souls, whether, under such circumstances, it is not painful beyond description to meet with many passages that must occur in the public reading of the scriptures. Take, for example, the following: Luke xii. 15. "Take heed and beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." 1 Tim. vi. 10. "The love of money is the root of all evil." Matt. v. 40. "If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." 2 Cor. xii. 14. "I will not be burdensome to you; for I seek not yours, but you." 1 Sam. xii. 3. "Whose ox have I taken? Or whose ass have I taken? Or whom have I defrauded? Whom have I oppressed?" Acts, xx. 33-4. "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me."

Now, I do not mean to assert, that there is any one of the above passages, which, if rightly understood, calls in question the Christian lawfulness of a clergyman's being possessed of property, or seeking legal remedies to maintain his rights, if invaded, or withheld. The point is not, whether such texts as these can be fairly, and justly, brought to bear, in condemnation of his proceedings; but whether he can, without distress and pain, stand forth to read them, in the face of those, who, however wrongfully, accuse him of covetousness, grinding, and oppression. His own conscience may acquit him. But surely he must be either above, or below, the level of man, if he does not feel that these are sore points; and that his circumstances are such, as to turn all eyes upon him, while his entanglements with the things of earth, his outstanding summonses, and processes appear, in this unfortunate, and revolting contrast, with the heavenly-mindedness and disinterestedness of Christ and his Apostles.

Allow, as I said before, that acquitted by his own conscience, he may, at such trying moments, throw himself upon God. Yet who can deny that for a minister of Christ, to find, not his solace, and refreshment, but his trial, in reading the word of God to his flock, speaks volumes against that system which can place them both in so strange and unnatural a predicament? And if the thoughts of tithe can thus hover round the clergyman in the reading-desk, they will still more haunt and harass him in the pulpit. For my own part, I can thank God that I have always been on the happiest terms, with my own flock; and that none of the foregoing observations, on the laity, are meant to apply to them. But this I will say, that if at any time I have feared an interruption of our harmony, the thoughts of its interference with my preaching, have been painful to the last degree. Not to speak of the temptation to the minister, encompassed with infirmities as he is, to feel coldly, and distantly towards those who treat him with unkindness; how can he address himself with power, or liberty, or enlargement, to those whose looks betray, that he is not in their confidence, or in their hearts? No. If there is not mutual affection, and mutual love, between the clergyman and his people, the life, and spirit of his ministry are gone. He may go through a round of ceremonial duties, but it is all a body, without a soul. As far as his agency goes, religion has lost her charm. His people will not "call the Sabbath a delight;" neither will they "be glad when it is said unto them, let us go into the house of the Lord." However successfully the battles of clerical property may be fought, in such a parish, piety will languish, and the visible will rise on the ruins of the invisible church. In a word, the spiritual parent will be bereaved of his children; and the flock will be as sheep having no shepherd. To all this I say, that if a Christian ministry over a Christian people be of divine institution, then, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

And if tithe, or composition be calculated to interrupt that harmony, without which the tie that binds these parties is virtually dissolved, let it, at all hazards, and in the face of all anticipated consequences, be done away.

Nor does this system act less unfavourably on the future prospects, than on the highest present interests of our church. It never could have been intended to perpetuate the state of things which now prevails. At any rate, whatever former intentions may have been, it is the bounden duty of the Established Church to bring the Roman Catholics, as far as she can, into her light, and within her pale. Now I contend for it, that if the clergy set about enforcing the payment of their tithe, with what is called vigour, one day's operation of that scheme may do more, in any given parish, to injure the cause of Protestantism, than years of patient and faithful ministerial labor could accomplish towards its furtherance. The plan proposed is, by making examples of a few, to awe the rest into submission. And these examples, I conceive, can be made but in one of three ways: 1. By bringing, on individuals, a heavy burden of expense. 2. By seizing on their persons. 3. By distraining their goods with military force. Now be it remembered, that the Romanists of this country are taught by their priests, that it is their duty to resist, or evade, the payment of tithe. All, then, who suffer in this cause are considered, as suffering for conscience sake. And the man who is selected by the clergyman as an example, will appear to his neighbors as a sacrifice to principle. If visited by heavy costs, every display will be made of the distress to which he has been brought down. If his person is seized on, he will, as he proceeds to gaol, assume all the magnanimity of a martyr. And if unhappily the military are called in, while their arms are glittering in the fields, and while children are running affrighted to their mothers, that day will not be lost; Irish tact will seize the critical moment to strike an impression never to be effaced, and to fix upon the youthful mind the lasting association of Protestantism with oppression, cruelty, and blood. Who that contemplates the possibility of scenes like these, would refuse to join with Solomon in saying, "Better is a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox, and hatred therewith."

No time could, in my mind, be more unfortunate for this threatening combination of the clergy, than the present. In the first place, the prices for every kind of produce are so low, as to render this a year of unexampled trial and difficulty to the farmer. Secondly, the ministers of our church were, by their Christian forbearance, just beginning to win on the affections of the Roman Catholics. The priests were rapidly losing any thing that could be called religious influence, and were more and more dependent on political agitation, as the only substitute. At such a moment, then, what means could be more dexterously contrived, to supply the priests with the very thing they want;

and to remove at once every favourable impression which our clergy had been making, than the threatening attitude which the latter have assumed? Thirdly, a few months will bring about the meeting of parliament. Then, in all probability, some plan will be concluded on for the settlement of church property. At all events, one of two things must happen: either tithe will be continued, or it will not be continued. Should the former unhappily be the case, nothing could tend so much to lessen the unpopularity to which that system must ever expose the clergy; as a manifestation now, that they are anxious, and would make large sacrifices, to free all parties from so fruitful a source of trouble and irritation. But if they manifest no disposition of the kind, if, backed by a powerful party, they effectually resist the plans, and wishes of government for its removal, the whole odium will fall with double weight on them. They will be considered as, not the unwilling agents, but the willing authors of the system; and tithe will be worse than ever. On the other hand, should the whole be done away; the clergy will, by this mismanagement, carry into the new system all the unpopularity of the old. It will not be forgotten, that they took their leave of tithe, with arms in their hands for its enforcement. Whatever is done for the peace of the country, will be considered as done in spite of them. And however favourably a better system than tithe may operate in other respects, it will fail of conciliating affection to the clergy.

Under such circumstances as these, it appears to me that the clergy ought, without drawback or stipulation, to avow their anxiety to be delivered from tithe and composition in every shape and under every possible modification. I shall now conclude this paper by briefly noticing a few of those objections which have been severally made by different portions of the clerical body. 1. Some admit all the evils of tithe, but think it better to submit to them, than to run the risks which church property must incur from any change. To this I answer, that the longer the clergy struggle for tithe, the more likely they are to bring the matter to such a point that they will lose all. But even if the option must be made between the moral mischiefs of the present system, and remote possibilities of temporal loss, it is better to risk property, than to injure souls: it is better to impoverish the church, than to convert it into an instrument of evil. 2. Others allow that they desire a change, nay, that they fully expect a change at the meeting of Parliament; but they think that by a show of strength, they may, as it were, make the better terms. To this I would say—take care that the present combination may not be rather a display of weakness, than a show of strength; a proof not how much, but how little, tithe can be gathered, by all this mighty effort. Besides, is such a *ruse de guerre*, taking all the circumstances of the case, befitting the “simplicity and godly sincerity” of ministers of the gospel? 3. Others contend that desirable as an alteration in church prop-

erty may be, the Parliament is not competent to make it. This is the part of the subject of which I know least, nevertheless, I would, on this head, ask three questions. Do not establishments rest on this as their foundation, namely, that it is the duty of Christian states to make provision for the maintenance and exercise of the Christian religion throughout the country? Is not the special argument for a Protestant establishment in Ireland, that the church (I mean the establishment of the church) is the creature of the state; and therefore the state being Protestant, the church may consistently be so, even in Roman Catholic districts of the empire? How then are these doctrines reconcilable with the notion that the state has no dominion over ecclesiastical property? 4. The last objection to which I shall allude is grounded on the fear that any income given in lieu of tithe, though of equal value for the present, will not be of the same fixed, and permanent nature. To this my answer is, that if the commutation be for land, the ground itself cannot be less stable than its own produce. If no other means can be devised for ridding the church of tithe than that of making the clergy stipendiaries of the state, why should we have a longer look-out after the things of this world than other men? The judges of the land, the law, and other functionaries of the crown, the officers of the army, and of the navy, these have no security beyond that of the government of the country. It is one of the worst effects of tithe, that it so fills with worldly calculations those minds which ought to be far differently employed, as often to cloud, and obscure the recollection, and apprehension of higher things. And though I grant it is but tempting Providence to refuse a due attention to our temporal concerns, yet assuredly it is the Christian's part, and supereminently the part of those who should be "ensamples to the flock," "to seek first, the kingdom of God and his righteousness." Let us make this our chief concern, and "all these things will be added unto us." As ministers of the church of England, we have, at a crisis like the present, no light responsibility in hand. It is our lot to "build her walls in troublous times." Let us try, then, for deeper foundations than human securities, and earthly pledges, and we shall have nothing to fear. Or, to change the metaphor, to us is committed, in a subordinate sense, the safe-conduct of that vessel which bears the everlasting Gospel, and the ark of God. She is tossed, it is true, upon an agitated and angry ocean. Let us, then, cast her anchor upon the Rock of ages, and she will resist the waves, and weather the storm.

H. W.

LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE OF HANNAH MORE.*

(Concluded from page 755.)

OUR former notice of the life and correspondence of this admirable woman, closed at the recorded success of the experiment made at Cheddar and vicinity, as to the practicability of combining the religious instruction of the heretofore deplorably neglected people, with the amelioration of their temporal condition, so as to give a practical exemplification of the truth, that "Godliness is profitable to all things, having the promise of the life which now is, as well as that which is to come." This was the first experiment of the kind made in modern times, and its success was beyond all expectation: and it was fitting that it should be so, seeing that they who made it were possessed but of moderate worldly means; that their physical energies were the reverse of robust; and that they were not patronized, at least at first, by the opulent and the great. Here, therefore, was exemplified the truth of the Apostle's declaration, that God hath chosen the foolish, and weak, and despised things, to confound the wise, and mighty, and exalted, to the end that "no flesh should glory in his presence; but that he who glorieth should glory in the Lord." It was the first; but how numerous and gloriously successful have been the many similar experiments since made! We could now fix upon many in our own country, and some in our own metropolis, signally blessed of God: but we forbear.

In 1791 the sisters, encouraged by the success with which God had crowned their efforts in Cheddar, determined upon extending them into other parts. There was in these, also, hostility; but it was mitigated. Some opulent farmers, when applied to for their countenance said, that these novelties would be the ruin of agriculture: others, who had seen accounts of the Sunday-schools previously established, thought they might be very good things for keeping boys from robbing orchards; and, upon the whole, as it was intimated that *no subscriptions would be asked*, they were allowed to proceed in peace. Two mining villages, at the top of Mendip were selected; ignorance here reigned even more supremely than at Cheddar, so that the first impression upon the people's minds was, that it was a money-making speculation, set on foot to get the children inveigled, and sold for slaves! It may tend to show the moral condition of the people, when we mention that—rather worse than even

* Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More. By William Roberts, Esq. 4 vols. 8vo. London, 1834.

our own 'Mud Island'—no constable would venture into these villages to execute his office. But God was with his devoted, though feeble servants; his glory they sought; and in ten parishes, in no one of which was there a resident clergyman, did they introduce their plans: more than twelve hundred children were brought under religious instruction; and though the labour was great—some of the schools being so far as fifteen miles from their residence, and the expense considerable—but which generous friends aided in defraying, perseverance, prudence, and zeal, under the blessing of God, were crowned with blessed results.

In a letter to Wilberforce, 1791, Hannah More tells him, respecting Cheddar, (and this applies pretty accurately to the others,) that they found 'more than two thousand people in the parish, almost all very poor; no gentry; a dozen wealthy farmers, hard, brutal, and ignorant.' They visited them all; picking up, at one house, like fortune-tellers, the name and character of the next. These men did not at all like their plans; but, hearing that they were not to pay anything, some were softened:

"One of the farmers seemed pleased and civil; he was rich, but covetous, a hard drinker, and his wife a woman of loose morals, but good natural sense; she became our friend sooner than some of the decent and the formal; and let us a house, the only one in the parish, at £7 per annum, with a good garden. Adjoining to it was a large ox-house; this we roofed and floored; and by putting in a couple of windows, it made a good school-room. While this was doing, we went to every house in the place, and found every house a scene of the greatest ignorance and vice. We saw but one Bible in all the parish, and that was used to prop a flower-pot. No clergyman had resided in it for forty years. One rode over, three miles from Wells, to preach once on a Sunday, but no weekly duty was done, or sick persons visited; and children were often buried without any funeral service. Eight people in the morning, and twenty in the afternoon, was a good congregation. We spent our whole time in getting at the characters of all the people, the employment, wages, and number of every family; and this we have done in our other nine parishes. On a fixed day, of which we gave notice in the church, every woman, with all her children above six years old, met us. We took an exact list from their account, and engaged one hundred and twenty to attend on the following Sunday. A great many refused to send their children, unless we would pay them for it; and not a few refused, because they were not sure of my intentions, being apprehensive that at the end of seven years, if they attended so long, I should acquire a power over them, and send them beyond sea."

Notwithstanding, the Lord sent them an admirable female teacher; they established morning and evening services for singing the praises of the Lord, prayer, and reading a sermon; work schools followed; the sick were visited; associations for bettering the temporal condition of the people came in course;

and some of the most opposed became themselves first of all *blessed*, and then were made *blessings* to others. We shall gratify our readers, and encourage those who may desire to work, and yet be deterred by difficulties, by presenting them with the following contrast. Thus speaks H. M. of one of the scenes they assailed :

"The great man of the place, illiterate but very sensible, is a shrewd speculative *atheist*. The next, a farmer of £1000 a year, let us know that we should not come there to make his ploughmen wiser men than himself; he did not want saints, but workmen. His wife, who, though she cannot read, seems to understand the doctrine of philosophical necessity, said, 'the lower class were *fated* to be poor, and ignorant and wicked; and that as wise as we were, we could not alter what was *decreed*.' To this the husband subjoined, 'Very true; besides he liked the parish very well as it was; if the young men *did* come and gamble before his house of a Sunday evening, when they might as well do it farther off, it was only for him to go out and curse and swear at them, and they went away, and what could one desire more?'"

Now for the 'Mendip Feast'—the result of labours in a soil so unpromising:

"I have kept this scrawl some days for want of time to finish it—so busy have we been in preparing for a grand celebrity, distinguished by the pompous name of *Mendip Feast*; the range of hills you remember in this country; on the top of which we yesterday gave a dinner of beef, and plumb-pudding, and cider, to our schools. There were not 600 children, for I would not admit the *new* schools, telling them they must be good for a year or two, to be entitled to so great a thing as a dinner. We had two tents pitched on the hill, our cloth was spread around, and we were inclosed in a fence, within which, in a circle, the children sat. We all went in waggons; and carried a large company of our own, to carve for the children, who sung psalms very prettily in the intervals. Curiosity had drawn a great multitude, for a country so thinly peopled; one wondered whence five thousand people, for that was the calculation, could come. I was very uneasy at seeing this, lest it should disturb the decorum of the festivity. Almost all the clergy of the neighbourhood came, and I desired a separate minister to say grace to each parish. At the conclusion I permitted a general chorus of 'God save the King,' telling them I expected that loyalty should make a part of their religion. We all parted with the most perfect peace, having fed about nine hundred people for less than a *fine* dinner for twenty costs. The day was the finest imaginable, and we got home safe, and I hope thankful, about eight miles, in our waggons."

Now, is the reader, whether churchman or dissenter, prepared for what follows? Not, if he judges of what *ought to be the conduct* of *puritanical professors*, (and we use the name, not in a way of *reproach*, but simply as designating a class which invariably finds the denomination too lax in which the Spirit of

God awakened them, and who, in the rage for *purity* of communion, often go from one religious body to another, till the *vitals* are first forgotten, and then even the *external purity* itself disregarded,)—not, we say, if he judges such persons by *their professions*, or by the word of God which they profess to revere; but he will not be surprised, if he have accurately noted the spirit and doings of many such persons, as they are exhibited in the everyday scenes of life. These people seldom have their love for souls kindled by seeing sinners perishing in ignorance and wickedness; but let inquiry be aroused, let some godly man come to a neglected spot, let some unholy family have a lodgment effected, on behalf of Christ, in the bosom of some one of the members, and immediately all their efforts are concentrated there, to proselyte to their peculiarities. Speaking of such persons Hannah More, in a letter to Wilberforce, 1792, says:

“I think it right that you and Mr. W—— should know what a sad spirit sets these new Seceders at work. You may depend on the truth of the enclosed. They do not now so much go to places which are in darkness and ignorance, as they once professed to do, but rather where the gospel is preached, in order to draw people away from the church and state I imagine they will quite knock up our labours at Cheddar, but we must strive the harder. I leave you to judge whether they are wanted at that place. Poor D—— preaches most faithfully to them on Sundays, and gives them a lecture in the church on Tuesday evenings, all for £25 per annum. We have at school, a sermon on Sunday evening, with a more select meeting of the most serious on Wednesdays: add to this, that both D—— and our excellent Mrs. T. at the school, have their doors open at all seasons to the distressed or inquiring. The sectaries are more inflamed against me than the high-church bigots; such an inconvenience is it to belong to no party, and so discreditable is moderation. A high-flier, (a friend, too,) told me the other day, he would advise me to publish a short confession of my faith, as my attachment both to the religion and the government of the country had become questionable to many persons. I own I was rather glad to hear it, as I was afraid I had leaned too strongly to the other side, and had sometimes gone out of my way, to show on which side my bias lay.”

Is there nothing like this going on in Ireland? Has not great spiritual havoc been made within the last thirty years, in many places, by such doings? Do our clerical brethren, in the simplicity of their hearts, and from the purest principles, never unwisely countenance them? “Love to all who love Christ,” say we; but even good men have their minds warped, and are not always *single* when they profess to be so, and perhaps think they are; and therefore, judgment and prudence are required in ministers of the gospel, lest mistaken zeal and spurious liberality tempt them unwittingly to injure the cause they have been honoured to promote.

Writing, as we do, for the benefit of our Christian and bene-

violent readers, we may as well notice the next recorded incident in Hannah More's life, for their caution. On her next visit to London, she learned that—

"A fine young creature had thrown herself into the canal in James's Park; and on following her to the Middlesex Hospital, learned that her father, who had given her a lady's education, had sold her (!) to an officer of the Guards, with whom she had been living; that they had quarrelled; and that she had determined to destroy herself. Miss More and friends reasoned with her; placed her in lodgings; watched over her, and did all they could for her temporal and spiritual good. She soon got tired; escaped; went on in sin; and, while in her letters to Hannah More professing compunction, declared her incapability of abandoning the course she was pursuing—even while expecting perdition to be the result. This did not chill philanthropy, but it moderated expectation."

We cannot, here, enter fully into the institutions formed for that class of our fellow-creatures usually and softly termed *unfortunate*, nor into an examination of the methods pursued for their good; but we may just suggest, for the consideration of those whom it may concern, that there is often, as the result of a bustling, meddling disposition, a course pursued which leads such persons to fancy they are doing their benefactors a kindness—that it is really a favour conferred, when they relinquish their course of life; that a slight touch of the beautiful in appearance, and of the romantic in history, often leads to the unwise and injurious exhibiting them as full of interest; that thus there is, perhaps, not too much of sympathy, but too little of horror of sin created; that they get the idea of misfortune, rather than of guiltiness, as that which attaches to them; and thus the way is paved for relapse, hastened by sentimentalism, and from the depths of impurity they enter perdition, with 'a lie in their right hand.' We neither accuse Hannah More of injudiciousness nor wish to discourage our Christian female *philogynists* in their anxious labours; but we would guard the over-sanguine against disappointment, and urge the ardent to combine caution and judgment with zeal and activity.

Versatility of talent is not always inconsistent with profundity of thought on the favourite subjects to which the mind is addicted; and we next find Hannah More a *political writer*. French revolutionary principles about this time began to spread with mischievous celerity; and such was the success with which wicked agitators were propagating inflammatory publications, that the populace seemed hastening on towards the abyss into which the French had plunged. The most influential and exalted looked to Hannah More, whose knowledge of human nature and tact for writing to the comprehension of the people were justly rated high, for aid in stemming the tide which had thus set in; and the result was the publication, but unknown to her friends till her style betrayed her, of "Village Politics, by Will Chip."

Its circulation was incredible; the highest ranks, not knowing whose it was, spent large sums in printing and circulating copies, and its effects were most extensive and salutary.

"Many persons," says the editor, "of the soundest judgment went so far as to affirm that it had essentially contributed, under Providence, to prevent a revolution; so true was the touch and so masterly the delineation, which brought out, in all its relief and prominence, the ludicrous and monstrous cheat, whereby appetite, selfishness, and animal force, were attempted to be imposed upon us, under the form of liberty, equality, and imprescriptible right."

Next to this followed her "Remarks on the speech of Dumont to the National Convention," which had the two-fold effect of checking blasphemy, and augmenting the fund for the relief of the French emigrant clergy, to which the profits were devoted. "Cheap Repository Tracts" came from the press in succession, of which two millions were sold the first year, and were eminently useful in making the power of reading, which schools gave, a blessing to the people. Since that period, what incalculable results have followed from the publication of religious small books and tracts—not only to the poor, for whom, as being cheap and simple, they were first intended, but also to the rich. During this period, however busy with her schools and writings, she kept up her correspondence with her friends in the metropolis; and we extract the following *morceaux*: the first from Bishop Porteous to her, the second from her to Horace Walpole, Earl of Oxford:

"MY GOOD FRIEND,—As you certainly belong to my diocese, and are on many accounts fairly entitled to the benefit of clergy, (for you cannot only read, but also write, and even preach to the great world more eloquently than most clergy-women,) I cannot do very much amiss, I think, in sending you the inclosed charge. There are two things at least you will learn from it—to sing psalms more melodiously in your parish church, and to reside more constantly in your proper diocese, from which (as I know by experience) you are too apt to wander, and to be led astray into the flowery paths of Cowlip, and such like seducing and dangerous places; where you forget, amidst the dissipations of solitude, your duty towards your neighbour, and never think of bestowing one single solitary line on Mr. Walpole, or on me; I have lately received a letter from him, in which he complains most bitterly of your pertinacious silence."

"Pray let us hear soon how your cowslips and daisies and acacias go on, and how many tons of hay you have this year; for I take it for granted you are a great farmer. I will be very generous to you, and give you three weeks' respite before you write to me; but if I do not find a letter on my return to Fulham, you must expect no mercy. Mrs. Porteous is entirely yours, and so is

Your very faithful and obedient servant,

B. LONDON.

"MY DEAR LORD,—The fortunes of petty people can only be attended with petty consequences; for instance, my having been free from excruciating headaches, scarcely six days in almost as many months, can be attended with no greater consequence to your lordship, than that of saving you from the trouble of a few pert and prating epistles; whereas had the same 'megrim' taken a fancy to the turbulent brain of the autocrat Catherine, half Europe might have been the better for it, as I think it would have left her neither capacity nor inclination to disturb its quiet. But though I have neglected to entitle myself to the pleasure of a letter from you, I have enjoyed one of the next best things, that of hearing good accounts of you; your recovered health and amended looks having made a very interesting part of several letters I have lately had from your neighbourhood.

"As I do not see by the newspapers (those authentic sources of intelligence) that you have separated yourself from your sweet neighbours, I figure to my imagination that you are all going on as delightfully as can be. I must really love you as well as I do, not to feel a little envious of the comfort you have in each other's society, and in the enjoyment of some of the best of mere human pleasures, taste, literature, and friendship.

"I have been much pestered to read the 'Rights of Woman,' but am invincibly resolved not to do it. Of all jargon, I hate metaphysical jargon; besides, there is something fantastic and absurd in the very title. How many ways there are of being ridiculous! I am sure I have as much liberty as I can make a good use of, now I am an old maid; and when I was a young one, I had, I dare say, more than was good for me. If I were still young, perhaps I should not make this confession; but so many women are fond of government, I suppose, because they are not fit for it. To be unstable and capricious, I really think, is but too characteristic of our sex; and there is, perhaps, no animal so much indebted to subordination for its good behaviour, as woman. I have soberly and uniformly maintained this doctrine ever since I have been capable of observation; and I used horridly to provoke some of my female friends, *maitresses femmes*, by it, especially such heroic spirits as poor Mrs. Walsingham. I believe they used to suspect me of art in it, as if I wanted to court the approbation of the other sex, who, it must be confessed, politically encourage this submissive temper in us; but I really maintained the opinion in sincerity and simplicity, both from what I felt at home and have seen abroad."

But it is more important and interesting to observe that her letters to John Newton, and a Diary, of which parts have been preserved, evince a decided growth of spirituality of mind and religious determination; establishing, as the history of the people of God invariably does, the fact, that when works of piety are engaged in—with the glory of Christ in view, and without neglecting to live with Christ in spiritual communion—instead of being unfavourable to advancement in personal religion, they exert a reflective influence most favourable to its growth and stability. "If any man WILL do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." She would not, indeed, be called a Calvinist; but John Newton assured her she was one neverthe-

less; while, to comfort her, he told her he was himself as far as she was from being what some exclusive pretenders to the name meant by it, or what ignorant opponents understood it to denote. At the commencement of 1798 the following occurs in the Diary:

"January 1, 1798.—Having obtained help of God, I continue to this day. Lord, I am spared, while others are cut off. Let me now dedicate myself to thee with a more entire surrender than I have ever yet made.

"I resolve by the grace of God to be more watchful over my temper. 2ndly. Not to speak rashly or harshly. 3dly. To watch over my thoughts; not to indulge in vain, idle, resentful, impatient, worldly imaginations. 4thly. To strive after closer communion with God. 5thly. To let no hour pass without lifting up my heart to Him through Christ. 6thly. Not to let a day pass without some thought of death. 7thly. To ask myself every night when I lie down, am I fit to die? 8thly. To labour to do and to suffer the whole will of God. 9thly. To cure my over-anxiety, by casting myself on God in Christ.

"Sunday, January 7.—I will confess my sins. Repent of them. Plead the atonement. Resolve to love God and Christ. Implore the aid of the Spirit for light, strength, and direction. Examine if these things are done. Be humbled for my failures. Watch and pray.

"Through death the Christian's soul goes to—1st. Purity. 2ndly. Fullness of joy. 3dly. Everlasting freedom. 4thly. Perfect rest. 5thly. Health and fruition. 6thly. Complete security. 7thly. Substantial and eternal good."

To this we append the following:

"Yet how hard it is to bring the mind seriously, earnestly, and practically to prepare for one's own call. When disappointments, sufferings, and trials, drive one off from one refuge, the vain and deceitful heart snatches at another. There are so many shades of worldliness, that it is easy to have renounced the ball, and the play, and ambition, and extravagance, and dissipation, without having made much, if any real advance towards God; and it is easy to wish for heaven, and yet very hard to get a heavenly mind."

Thus did she grow. But her writings of a more extended, general, and durable nature—which will go down with the English language to the latest posterity, and be prized wherever it is known, kept pace with her other labours; and her "Strictures on Female Education," "Hints to a Young Princess," "Cælebs in Search of a Wife," "Christian Morals," "Practical Piety," and, though last, not least important, "Essay on the Character and Writings of St. Paul," successively augmented her fame, benefitted the nation, and afforded a happy and extended field for the exercise of those talents which God had given her. Their circulation was immense, their value incalculable; but they are too well known to require any notice of their contents. Their utility was great, and will continue; and the unprecedentedly large sums they brought her, enabled her to gratify very widely her love for doing good.

They were introduced even into the royal family, and had no little share, from the sanction given them there, of influencing the sentiments and conduct of those in high places.

In 1802, Hannah More and her sisters removed from "Cowslip Green" to Barley Wood, which thenceforth became their constant residence. We could not pen anything more truly descriptive of her views, her feelings, her circumstances, than the following remarks, with which the editor of these volumes introduces this period of her life :

" Here Mrs. H. More hoped to enjoy that retirement and leisure for which she had long sighed ; but her talents for society and the literary and spiritual advantages derivable from her conversation, were too well appreciated to allow her propensity to be gratified. The world broke in upon her from every quarter, and as the greater part of her visitors resorted to her for improvement and advice, she felt it her duty to be free and accessible towards all who sought her society. The disposition of grounds, the embellishment of rural scenery, and even practical gardening, as far as her fragile frame could permit, were her favourite pursuits—pursuits which were exalted and refined by those high associations by which all that she put her hands to were invariably characterized.

" All her doings, little and great, from this epoch of her life, in which her time and her talents were consecrated to the highest service, were stamped with a divine impress that sufficiently denoted to whom they belonged, and to what they were directed.

" It is somewhat to be regretted that her celebrity occasioned such an unceasing influx of letters as to require the sacrifice of too large a portion of her time to the necessity (for her courtesy and kindness made it a necessity) of answering them. The world wanted her, and the world interrupted her—the world used and abused her—honoured her by its calumnies, and humbled her by its caresses—attempted to spoil, to affright, and to allure her equally in vain : its virtues made her weep for its vices, and its efforts to seduce her into conformity with its practices fixed her more on the safe side of that barrier which separates between earthly and heavenly-mindedness—between the children of disobedience and the subjects of grace."

We have a controversy with a very large portion of what is called the religious world, and we think a leaf out of Hannah More's Note-book more likely to settle it than any remarks of our own. The subject of this controversy is—the rage for religious story books, so called, especially if they be small ; and the utter aversion for works purely religious—an aversion often deep in proportion to the solidity and spirituality of a work ; and, to crown the climax of dislike, if the book be one, from its size and massiveness, likely to require time and thought in the perusal. Nothing is to us more symptomatic of the low state of religious taste and feeling than this mournfully prevalent state of things. Now, what says Hannah More ?

"I have fagged hard at good old Bishop Reynolds, a fat folio of near 1200 pages, which I have almost got through. Such solid Christianity! and such deep views of sinful man! And as to tediousness, I rather like it. I never can pick up any sustenance out of your short scanty books. As to new books, I know nothing, for I am not in the way here of borrowing or hiring, and I cannot afford to buy, because I have spent all my money on trees. Of books, however, it may in general be said, that 'the old are better.'"

"*Jan. 12*—Finished reading '*Halyburton's Life*.' It is so ill-written, so full of Scottish idioms and vulgarisms, and so uncouth, that, together with the gloomy state of his mind, it was a heavy labour to get through the first half; but the second made rich amends; it exhibits the most consolatory view of a soul having struggled with and conquered habitual sin; all ending in such a vigorous unshaken faith, and such a triumphant death-bed, as must animate the coldest heart, and leave the most cheering impression of the truth of Christianity. It would be well worth while to abridge, polish, and reprint this ill-written but striking testimony to the truth of religion."

"I have been reading, with pleasure, '*Bennet's Christian Oratory*.' It is not a brilliant work, but full of sound good sense, very spiritual, practical, and serious. I deal little in speculation, and never in controversial works, and like no devotion that is not sober-minded. Some of old Baxter's practical works, I think, you would admire. I have lately read his '*Advice to the Aged*,' his '*Dying Thoughts*,' and his '*Saints' Rest*.' One must allow for the style and diffuse manner of those voluminous old writers. They are, however, full of matter. I like them far better than our wordy moderns. I except Bishop Horsley and some few others."

Among the most valuable and valued friends of Mrs. More was Beilby Porteous, that truly apostolical man and exemplary bishop. It was her lot to survive him, as it was to survive so many others; and while we cannot make room for similar notices of others, we must insert the following brief ones of the closing scenes of the life of this holy man. He died in 1809, in 78th year of his age. He had been very recently on a short visit to his friend at Barley Wood, and Mrs. Kennicott writes to her the following affecting statements:

"I have much satisfaction in writing to you, my dearest friend, because I think the account I have to give of our beloved bishop is such as will afford you great consolation. After his fine mind had yielded to the infirmities of his weak body, his imperfect wandering ideas still led him to exert his small remaining strength in whatever appeared to him to tend to the glory of God; and the foundation of those two distressing notes to you was a report he had heard, of the institution of a club under the patronage of the Prince of Wales, which was to meet on a Sunday. Under this impression, he requested an audience of the Prince to entreat of him to fix on some other day. The audience was granted. Can any thing be imagined more affecting? Supported by two servants, and hardly able to move with their

assistance, he got to the apartment of the Prince ; and with agitated earnest conjured him to fix on some other day for this meeting. The Prince received him most graciously, seemed much affected, said it was not a new institution, and that it was founded on charity ; but that if the day could be changed to Saturday it should. It was during this business that he wrote those notes to you.

" The last week was a most distressing one at the time, but now to be reflected upon with comfort. Pious zeal and true Christian humility were prevalent amidst all his rambling. On the Friday he was brought to Fulham ; on entering the great hall he clasped his hands, and said, ' I thank God for permitting me to come once more to this place.' The next morning he said the air refreshed him, and he admired the beauty of his lawn. He was carried down to dinner, and soon after was seized with something like a convulsion, was taken to his sofa, had a cordial given to him, fell into a quiet sleep for three hours, and only just opened his eyes to close them for ever on this world. He had frequently prayed, but always with devout submission to God's will, to be spared the pangs of death ; and he was spared them."

Among her correspondents occurs the name of another bishop, a countryman of our own, one who, as a learned and able defender of the faith against the Socinian heresy, will not suffer upon a comparison with the ablest of the age—one whose volumes, if less widely circulated than the writings of his brother of London, because they were more deeply learned, and required, to appreciate them justly, erudition that comparatively the few only possess, are yet not less highly appreciated by that few in what quarter soever of the world they are known—our own Magee, the *flagellum* Socinianorum. While Fellow of Trinity College, an interchange of publications had taken place, accompanied by expressions of cordial good will and high esteem, between Hannah More and William Magee ; and we notice the fact the rather because, in a letter from the latter, dated Sept. 7, 1811, he expresses a hope to send, in the course of the winter, a " volume which had lain by him for nine years ; and one which he designed as the forerunner of an extended work on the prophecies relating to the Messiah." Is it not well deserving of minute and accurate investigation, whether among the Archbishop's manuscripts, such a work, in any thing like a state of preparedness for the press, can be found ? The following account of his own writings, and the contrast between them and her's, affords a good specimen of our late Prelate's style, and will be read with interest :

" The modern Socinian is a most impracticable subject. On him there seems but little chance of making any impression. I found myself obliged, therefore, to look from him altogether, and to turn myself to those who might be in danger of being entrapped by his wiles. Having no hope of reclaiming, my sole object has been to expose him. And, in truth, I cannot help considering my occupation as bearing a strong resemblance to that of the thief-catcher—which, though it may be a very useful, is certainly not a

very honourable species of employment. I have sometimes feared that the language I have been compelled to use might go beyond the sympathy of the reader. And yet, in reality, the desperate duplicity and deliberate dishonesty of the thorough-faced champions of the cause far transcend all that the strongest language could convey. Much as I have been able to bring to light, it gives but a faint idea of what *might* be dragged forth out of this den of Cacus, could either the moral taste or human patience of the reader endure the full exhibition. I confess, for my own part, I am literally sick of the subject, and grieve to have had so much time so expended. With the exception of (possibly) a separate publication of that part of the volumes which relates to the Socinian controversy exclusively, (a measure to which I have alluded in the present volume, and to which the Bishops of Durham and St. David's strongly encourage me,) together with, perhaps, a few additional observations which Unitarian animadversions on what has now been published may occasion, I mean never to give up another hour to an exercise of mind which is so little favourable to the acquisition or the communication of knowledge, and which is so peculiarly unfriendly to the cultivation of a Christian temper.

"How forcibly, my dear madam, do I find myself impressed with the contrast between your labours and mine! Not to speak of those felicitous powers which are displayed so variously and so irresistibly through the numerous writings with which you have enriched the world, and which, as they are so rarely bestowed, are fairly to be considered as without the range of ordinary comparison—your pen has been employed in portraying all that is rational and amiable in human conduct; and in exhibiting, in the most attractive colours, all that is worthy of the love and admiration of human kind. By enforcing the principles of duty, and embellishing the truths of religion, you have been advancing others and yourself in the path of true happiness. Whilst engaged in the delightful task of directing and cheering forward your fellow-creatures in their progress to that better state of being for which they were designed, you have been by the same act continually heightening the monitor into the guide, and have had the blessed reward of your own exertions returning upon yourself from the very efforts which you made for others. In a word, you have been exercising every worthy feeling of the heart, and every healthful faculty of the understanding, for a great and expanded purpose commensurate with the best interests of the human race; whilst I have been doomed to a tedious warfare against sophistry and falsehood—compelled to wear out patience and charity in a painful but necessary combat with those who would rob the Christian of his hope, and drain away the very life-blood from Christianity."

Our remaining space now is very limited, and we must not indulge in lengthened remarks or extended quotations. One after another of her sisters and beloved Christian friends called to suffer—called home, gave scope for the exercise of sympathy, submission, and faith. One after another of the plans of Christian benevolence, for the temporal and spiritual good of mankind, demanded and received her interest and aid. Every day almost

brought fresh visitors from all quarters. Her health was ever poor, and yet her pen was scarcely ever idle. Nor is it wonderful, when we find a Russian princess and Cinagelese priests translating her works into the languages of their respective countries. But, with a few brief notices preceding, we hasten to the closing scenes—so admirably telling how a Christian can die. In 1818, Hannah More had one of those preliminary illnesses which betokened the near approach of the last scene; yet, soon after, issued from the press, “Moral Sketches;” one of her friends being accustomed to say, he expected a new work after every fresh illness; as if every indication of the coming hour, “when no man can work,” was a fresh stimulus to “work while it is called today.” The death of her beloved sister, Martha, followed—her associate in all her works of practical benevolence—on whom, indeed, the greater part of the burden fell, and whose piety was not less intense or exalted than her own. In 1820, a still more severe attack led her friends and herself to give up all hope of recovery. A few interesting records of this period we quote:

“On the night of the 12th of August, Mrs. H. More called all the family out of their beds around her own, being seized with an obstinate obstruction on the chest, which for some time resisted the most powerful expedients to remove it. Upon recovering her speech, after repeated faintings, she earnestly requested the prayers of the friend who was supporting her head, and at intervals, as she was able, repeated a great part of the xvth Psalm, with a little alteration, to make it speak the better to her own soul: ‘Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, for thou *didst* not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption.’ She went on, ‘Thou shalt show me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.’ She repeated also most of the xxiird Psalm, and desired to have some verses, here and there, from the cxixth, read to her. She then exclaimed, ‘Oh my gracious God, help me, a poor sinner!’ She was answered, ‘He will give strength for all need,’ to which she replied, ‘I have no doubt of it. Life is of no value upon the terms I have held it for the last eleven months. If it were his good pleasure, I could hope that my sufferings may not be very tedious, but I dare wish for nothing that is not consistent with his blessed will.’ Upon another occasion, Miss F. the friend who was chiefly with her at this period, having said, ‘I trust you will be better tomorrow:’ she answered, ‘If it be God’s will, I hope so; when, where, and as thou wilt, O Lord! I who have written so much upon submission to the will of God, ought now to practise it.’ To her friend and physician who attended her, she said, ‘This old crazy building is a long time in breaking up, Doctor.—A gentle dismission, if it please God!’ Part of the xlist Psalm being repeated to her, beginning, ‘Blessed is he that considereth the poor and needy,’ &c. she said, ‘A beautiful Psalm! but all my trust is through grace; all my hope is for mercy; and all I ask is acceptance through Jesus Christ. What should I do now if the work were to be begun.’”

* * * *

"In an interval of severe suffering, she cried, 'Lord, say unto my soul, thy sins be forgiven thee!' and after a moment she resumed, 'the sufferings of this present time are not to be compared,' &c. O how this corruptible body presseth down the soul! Oh, Adam, what hast thou done? There had been no sickness had there been no sin; but no sin, no Saviour; and no Saviour, a happiness far short, possibly, of what we hope for through him.' 'Oh what will it be,' she added, 'when our eyes close on this scene and open upon the world of spirits! I have often thought, since I have been lying here, of poor Thistlewood's expression: 'We shall soon know the grand secret.' A Christian may say the same; it is a secret equally to him: but he says it with a firm faith, and well-grounded assurance, that there is a reward for the righteous, that there is a God who judgeth the earth.'"

"In the course of conversation, she spoke of the joys of heaven, and said, 'It is delightful to know that they will be unspeakable and full of glory: rest in the bosom of God and the Saviour, and a full enjoyment of his presence, chiefly present themselves to my mind. The meeting with dear friends will, I should think, constitute a part of our felicity, but a very subordinate one; like Whitfield, I think we shall be apt to say, 'Stand back, and keep me not from the sight of my Saviour.' Important as doctrines are,' she observed, 'yet except the leading ones, for which we ought to be ready to be led to the stake, they yield much with me to the purifying of the inward hidden man of the heart. Conformity to God, a walking in his steps, spiritual-mindedness, a subduing the old Adam within us—here is the grand difficulty and the acceptable offering to God! It is observable,' she remarked, 'that in the introductory verses to almost all St. Paul's epistles, he says, Grace, mercy, and peace—peace comes after grace and mercy.'"

"'You have been a blessing to the world,' said Mr. —; 'No,' she replied, 'mine has been a poor little way; I have done nothing, I *could* do nothing: the righteousness, mercies, and merits of Christ, are all in all.' In acute suffering, she exclaimed, 'How long, O Lord, how long! but I have not yet suffered enough for my purification.'

"Her attendant observed, 'If you need all this, ma'am, we may be well filled with dismay.' To which she answered, 'The blood of Christ is sufficient; there is no acceptance for the best without it, and with it the worst need not fear obtaining pardon and salvation upon repentance; but it must be profound *heart-repentance*.' An earnest hope being expressed for her recovery, she said, 'Don't wish it—pray that His will may be done in me and by me; pray that I may bear testimony to His faithfulness unto the end. I would renounce everything except my hold upon the Rock of my salvation.'"

From this, however, she recovered, and was able to correspond with her friends, and enjoy their society. We quote the following,

respecting one eminent man of God yet living, William Jay, and one gone before, Rowland Hill :

“ Mr. Jay, of Bath, whose chapel she frequented under the circumstances which she explained to her diocesan, in the letter which has been already produced, and of whom Mrs. More's high opinion is well known, has favoured me with the following particulars :

“ ‘ One day in a dinner party at Mrs. More's house in Bath, he was lamenting the ingratitude Mrs. M. had recently met with from a person he had recommended to her beneficence—upon which he received a look from her which silenced him ; and after dinner drawing him into a corner of the room, she said, ‘ You know we must never speak of such things as these before people ; for they are always too backward to do good ; and they are sure to dwell upon such facts to justify their illiberality.’ She finely added, ‘ It is well for us sometimes to meet with such instances of ingratitude, to show us our motives, for if they have been right we shall not repent of our doing ; though we lament the depravity of a fellow-creature. In these instances, also, as in a glass, we may see little emblems of ourselves ; for what, after all, is the ingratitude of any one towards us, compared with our ingratitude towards our infinite benefactor.’ ”

“ Mr. Jay said this was but in character with *all she said and did* through a long and favoured intimacy with her after he came to Bath ; adding— ‘ Great as her fame has been, I never considered it equal to her merit. Such a fine and complete combination of talent and goodness, and of zeal and discretion, I never witnessed. All her resources, influences, and opportunities were simply and invariably made to subserve one purpose, in which she lived, not to herself, but to Him who died for us and rose again.’ ”

“ ‘ There was nothing, he said, he admired more than her *conversation*, and not only its eloquence, but its judiciousness, its selectness, its appropriateness. Whatever was the party or the topic, ‘ upon her tongue was the law of kindness.’ There was never a word to offend, or wound, or grieve, but always something to instruct and improve ; ‘ her speech was always with grace, seasoned with salt, and ministered to the edifying of the hearers.’ ”

“ ‘ You could not,’ he said, ‘ touch her without finding her electrical wit, genius, and godliness. Her very praise was moral. If she praised a sermon, it was not a sermon that might have a little air of originality, but one that commended itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. She often remarked, that preaching was an instrument, and the best instrument was that which did its work best.’ ”

“ Mr. Jay remarked that when forty-four years ago he first saw her in his congregation, she tried him more than any hearer he had preached before ; but when he had become acquainted with her, and was secure of her friendship, he was pleased to see her present. He soon made her a confidante ; entreating her to point out any thing she deemed exceptionable, or capable of improvement in one so young and inexperienced ; and he acknowledged with gratitude many valuable hints derived from her judgment, in the discharge of his ministry.

"He also admired the moderation of her doctrinal sentiments, and said how well they had always accorded in their dislike of the jargon of the schools, and whatever men had rendered metaphysical and exclusive in the gospel of the God of all grace. She was, however, he said, fond of reading the works of many of the old divines, and even those of the puritans and nonconformists, remarking, with her inimitable smartness, 'that she found nothing more good than the lean of their fat.'"

"You cannot imagine how delighted we were with dear old Rowland; instead of a coarse, quaint being, disposed to deal out his witty sarcasms against all, however good, who were not of his *particular genus*, we found a mild mellowed Christian, of a liberality which really astonished us! He quite overflowed with amiable and truly pious conversation, and this was so seasoned with point, humour, and a delightful oddity which was all his own, that we were beyond measure entertained as well as edified by his company, and it made the three hours he spent with us, appear no more than half an hour. He talked with cordial love of Wilberforce, and spoke very highly of Archbishop Magee. He is an excellent hater of Antinomian doctrines, and I was glad to see such a soundness of Christian principle in the good old man. Upon the question being put to him 'How many persons he had vaccinated with his own hand?' Mrs. M. said, 'I have heard so many as six thousand.' 'Yes, Madam,' he replied, 'nearer eight thousand.' We talked of everybody, from John Bunyan to John Locke, and he really showed an excellent discrimination and tact in character. But the most beautiful feature of all was the spirit of love and charity which was eminently conspicuous in this Christian veteran. I cannot express to you how interesting a spectacle it was to see these two *already* half-beatified servants of their common Lord, greeting one another for the first, and probably the last time on this side Jordan, preparatory to the consummation of an union and friendship which will last for ever in the regions of eternal felicity. I do suppose that no two persons, in their own generation, have done more good in their *respective ways* than Hannah More and Rowland Hill. Both have exceeded fourscore; both retain health and vigour of intellect; both are on the extreme verge of eternity, waiting for the glorious summons, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father.' He concluded this very interesting visit with a fine prayer, which was poured forth in an excellent voice and manner. I really don't know that upon any occasion I have been more gratified."

Hannah More had expected to close her earthly career in Barley Wood; but the vile misconduct of a nest of unprincipled domestics, unwittingly fostered by her reluctance to severe measures, compelled her to break up the establishment and dismiss them *en masse*, lest she should be suspected of patronizing, at the age of eighty three, or at least conniving at immoral profligacy. She removed to Clifton; and on casting a longing, lingering look on this scene of her highest enjoyments, before entering the carriage, she exclaimed, "I am driven, like Eve, out of Paradise; but not, like Eve, by angels."

Her memory and other intellectual powers now began to evince symptoms of decay; but, as has often been remarked of eminent servants of God, whenever the darling theme, the Saviour, was introduced, or a well-known text quoted, her mind seemed to rouse and her memory to become fresh as ever. After a period of five years spent at Clifton, her valuable life reached its close, on Friday, the 6th of September, 1833.

"Her face was smooth and glowing; there was an unusual brightness in its expression. She smiled, and endeavouring to raise herself a little from her pillow, she reached out her arms as if catching at something, and, while making this effort, she once called 'Patty' (the name of her last and dearest sister) very plainly, and exclaimed, 'Joy!' She fell asleep."

The following memoranda of her deathbed conversations must close this long, but, we trust, not unprofitable article:

"'Upon one occasion,' says the faithful friend who was always about her dying bed, 'in the early part of her illness, I read to her the office for the visitation of the sick, and the burial service in the Book of Common Prayer. She was still, and engaged, while I was reading, with her hands clasped in devotion. Some of the verses in the Psalms, after I had begun them, she would finish, exclaiming with rapture, 'how beautiful, how sweet—delighting the taste and touching the heart.' The fifty-first Psalm was continually on her lips: 'Create in me a clean heart, and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me.'

"When the prison doors were open, and her soul was on the point of escaping to its true home, though a thick veil was spread over the world she was leaving, no look of regret, but one of sweet sympathy with its trials and sorrows was often cast behind her; nor could the awful change which awaited her, dislodge from her heart that love of souls which had supported her through so many years of bodily suffering in her various works of Christian beneficence. Prayer was the last thing that lived in her—every breath was prayer; and in the vital energy of her expiring petitions, her affectionate friends and those that administered to her wants, and soothed her last conflict, were earnestly commended to the great Advocate of repentant sinners. The lady who had long taken such kind care of her, and was kneeling at the bed's side, was thus addressed by her shortly before her departure: 'I love you, my dear child, with fervency. It will be pleasant to you twenty years hence to remember that I said this on my death-bed. Be near me, and with me as much as you can, will you? I may last out a few days—how long does the Doctor think I shall live?' 'She was always,' says this lady, 'bestowing blessings on those around her, and hoping they should meet in a happier world—in an eternal and glorious world;' and when she was told of some presents made in her name to those who were employed in her service, with a smile almost amounting to a laugh, she exclaimed, 'I am glad of it, glad of it.' Adverting to her own frame of spirit, she said, 'I hope my temper is not peevish, or troublesome.' And

on being answered that it was the temper of an angel, she said, 'Oh no, not of an angel, but of a very highly favoured servant of the Lord, my Saviour.'

"The Psalms, and other passages of scripture were perpetually breaking from her lips, and it seemed extraordinary to those who were about her, that her memory, which had let almost every terrestrial impression slip away, had kept the registry of her devout recollections unobliterated and unimpaired. The loins of her mind were girded up, and her soul braced as it were to meet without amazement the strange and awful encounter which was approaching. Like one preparing for a great expedition, all impediments thrown aside, all but the necessary implements to set up her tabernacle in the place of her destination and final rest.

"She was sometimes, says Miss Frowd, painfully conscious of the disturbed and confused state of her mind. One day she put her hand to her head, and exclaimed, 'I am all confusion, I seem quite to have lost my understanding. My mind is all so (shaking her hand before her eyes); I used to entertain my friends, and be agreeable to them. If I shed tears, they are tears of gratitude, and from a sense of my unworthiness.'

"The philosophical reader, when he contemplates this buoyancy of hope and trust amidst the languors of a last sickness at an age verging on four-score years and ten, will find a difficulty in accounting for it by any analogies of nature, and if he is determined to see nothing supernatural in it, he must be content to sit down in ignorance and wonder; but to the Christian inquirer the phenomenon will show itself under another aspect: he will see and adore in it the Spirit's work and the succours of Divine help; he will see in it the process of a second birth in a dying child of Adam; he will see in it the funeral of death, its sting extracted, the grave spoiled, and Satan discomfited; he will find in it the best comment upon the Psalmist's exclamation, 'Right dear in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.'

"To save space we lay before our Christian readers the sentences which escaped from her lips at intervals during the latter portion of her last illness, requesting them not to forget that at this period she had arrived at her eighty-ninth year. They were committed to writing by one who dearly prized her posthumous honour for the sake of the generation which has succeeded her; but whom neither this nor any other consideration could ever have induced to dress up her sentiments in any other idiom than her own. Plain as it was, it was the vehicle only of her earnest pleadings with her merciful and awful Judge.

"She said to those who surrounded her—'Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus is all and all. God of grace, God of light, God of love, whom have I in heaven but thee?' When very sick she said, 'What can I do? What can I not do with Christ? I know that my Redeemer liveth. Happy, happy are those who are expecting to be together in a better world. The thought of that world lifts the mind above itself. My God, my God, I bless thy holy name. Oh! the love of Christ, the love of Christ. Mercy, Lord is all I ask! I am never tired of prayer. Pray, pray that the dear mistress of this house may be supported

in her last hours. I pray to God to forgive my many offences, to make me humble, and looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith. Lord establish, strengthen us! 'The heavens declare the glory of God.' How I love that psalm! Oh, eternal, immortal Lord, I prostrate myself before thee, utterly unworthy of thy mercy! Holy Lord, into thy hands I commend my spirit! into thy hands I commend my unworthy self—unworthy, but penitent!' Upon being asked if any thing could be done to make her more comfortable, she said 'Nothing, but love me, and forgive me when I am impatient.' Upon her servant's proposing to read a chapter to her, she said, 'What are you going to read?' and upon being told the resurrection of Christ, she said, 'If we meet at his feet we shall be equal!' She said to her attendant, who had been repeating some psalms and hymns, 'You cannot have your mind too much stored with these things; when you get old, or are in solitude, they will supply you with comfort.' After repeating the Doxology, she said to her servant, 'The word Trinity, you know, means three. I once lived in a street called Trinity Street; I do think it very wrong to put such sacred names to common things.' She often exclaimed, 'Lord have mercy upon me, Christ have mercy upon me, and make me patient under my sufferings. Take away my perverse and selfish spirit, and give me a conformity to thy will. May thy will be done in me, and by me, thy praise and glory: I desire only to be found at the foot of the cross. Lord, I am thine; I am not my own; I am bought with a price, a precious price, even the death of the Lord Jesus Christ. Lord have mercy upon me; grant me an abundant entrance into thy kingdom! Jesus my Saviour and my friend.' She talked much of the many mercies of God to her, through her very long life. To an intimate friend she said, she hoped they should meet in glory; for herself she had but one object in view, and that was to wait the Lord's time. 'Lord strengthen my resignation to thy holy will. Lord have mercy upon me a miserable sinner. Thou hast not left me comfortless. O Lord strengthen me in the knowledge of my Saviour Jesus Christ, whom I love and honour. How many parts of Scripture speak of the necessity of our being born again! Raise my desires, purify my affections, sanctify my soul. To go to heaven—think what *that* is! To go to my Saviour, who died that I might live. Lord humble me; subdue every evil temper in me. May we meet in a robe of glory; through Christ's merits we can alone be saved! Look down, O Lord, upon thy unworthy servant with eyes of compassion.' A friend said to her, 'Our good works will not save us.' She said, 'Our good works are nothing, but without them we cannot be saved.' You must pray for me, that my sins may be forgiven me for Christ's sake.' After repeating the 51st Psalm, she said, 'Pour out such a measure of thy grace upon me, that I may be enabled to serve thee in spirit, soul, and body, and that loving thee, I may come unto thee through Jesus Christ.' Oh, my Saviour, forsake not her whom thou has redeemed.' Feeling herself linger in her sickness, she said to a friend, 'My dear, do people never die? Oh, glorious grave! I pray for those I love, and for those I pity and do not love.' She said, 'It pleases God to afflict me, not for his pleasure, but to do me good, to make me humble and

thankful. Lord, I believe; I *do* believe with all the powers of my weak sinful heart. Lord Jesus, look down upon me from thy holy habitation; strengthen my faith, and quicken me in my preparation! Support me in that trying hour when I most need it! It is a glorious thing to die! When one talked to her of her good deeds, she said, 'Talk not so vainly; I utterly cast them from me, and fall low at the foot of the cross.'

STARS IN THE DARKNESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—Amid the endless inconsistencies and figments of Polytheism, a few insulated passages testify of Deity in his oneness and incommunicable attributes, and of man in his moral accountability, his unexpiated sin, and his immortal destiny.

These, like stars in the darkness, shine out with an excellent and grateful lustre; and the dim light faintly reveals to our straining vision, human reason, fallen, though unconquered, struggling with his giant compeers, ignorance and sin.*

St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Roman Church, says, that God left the heathen without excuse, inasmuch as he surrounded them with visible proofs of the eternity and power of the Invisible Supreme. (Rom. i. 20.) Thus Cicero, (Liber 2. De. nat. deorum. n. 97,) speaking of the starry heavens, and the regular succession of the seasons, concludes with the following exclamation: "Dubitamus quin ea non solum ratione fiant, sed etiam excellenti divina que ratione?" And the Apostle himself, in occasional references to heathen authors, seems to admit that a dawning light was there.

Of such reference three instances occur in the New Testament, and in every instance the quotation has been made by St. Paul. That extraordinary and ardent advocate was, like Moses, deeply versed in the learning of the heathen; and, carefully selecting the sweet from the bitter, he appealed, perhaps frequently, to the corroborative testimony of their philosophers and poets; thus dexterously adapting his discourse to the feelings of his auditors, becoming "all things to all men," whether Roman,

* Solon's reply to Cræsus, when that monarch displayed the abundance of his riches, appears to me replete with painful interest. While the philosopher is persuaded of the instability and misery of mortal life, expectation of happiness in a future state is left unexpressed, and yet would seem to be inferred—"He, who is prosperous today, may be the reverse tomorrow: no man, therefore, can be said to be happy before death."—(*Plutarch in Solon.*)

Greek, or Celt;* nevertheless, without sullyng the truth, or compromising the freedom of the Gospel.

The first heathen author to whom St. Paul refers, is Aratus, a poet and astronomer, and a countryman of the apostle's, having been born in Cilicia, 277 B. C. The quotation is from the *Φαινόμενα*, a poem composed at the desire of Antigonos Gonatus, King of Macedonia, on the position, motion, and number of the stars. This work, and Cicero's Latin version thereof, are both extant. The quotation occurs, Acts, xvii. 28, 'Ὡς καὶ τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς Ποιητῶν εἰρηκάσι· "Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γενοῦ εἰμεν." St. Paul says *τινες*, as if he referred to more than one; and it is remarkable that the words, with the difference of only one letter, occur in Cleanthes' celebrated Hymn to Jupiter,† a composition which breathes an ardent spirit of pure theism. Cleanthes was the successor of the Stoic, Zeno, and died B. C. 250. The Hymn has been tolerably translated by Mr. West.

The verses immediately preceding Acts, xvii. 28, are parallel with the context of the passage quoted from Aratus, who, in affirmation of the pervading presence and power of the Deity in and through all nature, concludes with the inference referred to by St. Paul. The Apostle commences his address, by plainly telling the Athenians, that they were "overmuch given to the worship of demon-gods," Δεισιδαιμονεστεροι.‡ He then points to the altar *Ἀγνωστω Θεῷ*, erected as if in silent confutation of their polytheistic error; and finally, without openly alarming their bigotry, leads them, by a confirmatory quotation from a heathen author, to an admission of the truth preached, and a conviction of the error practised. Not one of the wise of this world who were present attempted to reply, save by mockery and petulant reproof; and the faith of several distinguished individuals was shaken, and fell. Such consummate skill, and knowledge of the human heart, did the Apostle Paul manifest in his addresses.

* St. Clement (1. Corinth. Section 6,) says of St. Paul—"And so having taught the whole world righteousness, and for that purpose travelled even to the uttermost bounds of the west," &c. From which allusion it would seem probable, that even these islands, the Ultima Thule, had felt the might of his inspired eloquence.

† The passage in Cleanthes: *Εκ σου γὰρ γινος ἴσμεν.*

The passage in Aratus: *Του γὰρ καὶ γινος ἴσμεν.*

Homer also calls Jupiter, *Πατρὸς ἀνδρῶντι Σιῶντι.*

‡ How strange to reflect, that in the nineteenth century multitudes, professing to follow St. Paul, hold a doctrine, and practise an error, analogous to those which he condemns. It can, I think, be clearly proved, that the *Δαιμονίς* of the Greeks, and the *Divi* of the Romans, were considered by the philosophers of those ancient nations as intercessory spirits with the Supreme Jove. The temples were the shrines of these mediatorial beings; and their respective priests instructed the supplicant, and directed his petitions. What essential difference is there between the apotheosis of the Roman emperor, or Grecian hero, and the canonization of the crusader, or Roman bishop?

The second author, whose words St. Paul uses, although in this instance without acknowledgment, is Menander, who was born at Athens, B. C. 342. According to Plutarch, "He abounds in a precious Attic salt, which seems to have been taken from the same sea whence Venus herself arose." Menander became an especial favourite with the Athenians, for the delicacy of his wit, and terse excellence of his style. History and literature have suffered materially by the loss of his works, if we may judge from the fragments remaining, from the opinions of Roman critics,* and from the circumstance that the elegant and polished Terence borrowed largely from his dramatic compositions, which were eighty in number. The quotation alluded to is a senary Iambic, supposed to be from the lost comedy of *Thais*, and occurring in 1 Corinth. xv. 33:

Φθιρουσιν ἢν χρησθ' ἰμῶλαι πασαι.

The following fragments of Menander are well worthy of preservation; and we may form a favourable opinion of the refinement of Athenian taste subsequent to the days of Aristophanes, when we contrast these passages with the errors and absurdities of the French or English school of comedy in the nineteenth century:

Εἰ τις δι' ὄψιν προφέρειν, ὦ Παμφίλει,
 Ταυρῶν τι πλῆθος ἢ ἐρίφων, ἢ, ἢ Δία,
 Ἐστῶν ταυτῶν, ἢ κατὰ σπουδαίαν
 Χρυσᾶς σκευῆς χλαμυδὸς ἢτοι παρφυρᾶς,
 Ἡ δ' ἰλιφαντος, ἢ σμαραγδοῦ ζῶδια,†
 Εὐνοῖν ἰομίζει τοὶ θεοὶ καδίσταται,
 Πλαστὰς ἰκίνοι, καὶ φρίνας κοῦφαι ἐχέει.
 Διὶ γὰρ τοὶ ἀνδρᾶς χρεῖσι μοι τιφύονται,
 Μὴ παρδίνους θύειντα, μὴ μοχλωμένον,
 Κλιστόντα, καὶ σφαττόντα χρεμάτων χάριν.
 Μὴδὲ βίλωνις ἱαμμὶ' ἐσιδυμῆς, Παμφίλει
 Ὅ γὰρ θεὸς βλάπτει σὺ πλῆστοι παρών.

Pamphilus! who makes a costly offering
 Of all the cattle, which the mountains bring,
 Or gold and purple, cunning broidery,
 Or statues carved in gem and ivory,
 And thus expects to make the godhead kind,
 He grossly errs, and knows not his own mind.

* Novam comicam Menandrus, æquales ejus, cœtatis magis quam operis Philemon ac Diphilus, et invenere intra paucissimos annos, neque imitandum reliquere.—*Vellsius Paterculus*.

† Ita omnem vitæ imaginem expressit tanto in eo inveniendi copia et eloquendi facultas ita est omnibus rebus personis affectibus accommodatus.—*Quintilian*.

† The ζῶδια were probably the tiny statues contained in the *pan* or miniature models alluded to in Acts xix. 24.

For he who asks a favouring Deity,
Should strictly practise spotless chastity,
And shun all avarice which leads to blood.
Oh! covet not thy neighbour's smallest good;
For, omnipresent and omniscient,
God sees thy secret purpose and intent.

I. L.

Here the morality is unexceptionable; and the prefixed article may, perhaps, denote distinctively the unity, while the last line expressly affirms the omniscience and omnipotence of Deity. The passage forms not an inappropriate parallel to the inspired address of the prophet Micah, vi. 7, 8; and the vigour, earnestness, and animation, manifested in both might lead a fanciful inquirer to discern a similarity of style and expression in the writers:

Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams?
With ten thousands of rivers of oil?
Shall I give my first born for my transgression—
The fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?
He hath showed thee, O man, what is good;
And what doth the Lord require of thee,
But to do justly, and to love mercy,
And to walk humbly with thy God?

Dimly, indeed, does the intuitive perception of the heathen poet scan the truths which inspiration unveiled to Micah; yet pleasing conjectures crowd upon us, when we recollect that, four hundred years after the decease of the graceful Athenian, the golden-tongued and dauntless Apostle of the Gentiles, on his mission to the native city of Menander, pointed appealingly to the altar in the Areopagus inscribed, *Αγνωστω Θεω*.*

* Lucian, in his Dialogue entitled *Philopatri*, swears "by the unknown God at Athens:" and adds: "Having arrived at Athens, and finding there the unknown God, we worshipped Him, and gave thanks to Him, with hands upraised to heaven." Analogous to this mysterious worship seems that singular fancy of Adrian, who reared temples, in which were neither images nor statues. Lampridius, a biographer of the fourth century, relates, that according to common report, that Emperor meditated the design of consecrating these nameless fanes to the worship of Christ. The Emperor Alexander Severus, also, had a statue of our Lord in his oratory, or private chapel. It is well authenticated, that the heathen nations of antiquity used to adopt the gods of neighbouring kingdoms, as well as impose the worship of their own deities on the conquered. Now, this altar may have been dedicated to Jehovah, the God of the Jews; and the circumstance of the Jews having considered the name of Deity unpronounceable, may have suggested the motto *Αγνωστω Θεω*.

Menander's opinion of polytheism, in its purest form, the deification of the elemental powers of nature, may be conjectured from the following fragment, wherein he ridicules the sentiments of a celebrated follower of Pythagoras :

“Ο μιν Επιχαρμος τοὺς θεοὺς οὐκ ἀγαπᾷ,
 Αἰμάς, ὕδωρ, γῆν, ἥλιον, πῦρ, ἀστέρων·
 Ἐγὼ δὲ ὑπελάβον χρησίμους οὐκ θεοὺς
 Τ' ἀργύριον ἥμιν καὶ τὸ χρυσοῖον μόνον.
 Ἰδρυσάμενος τοὺτους γὰρ οὐκ ἐν τῇ κίχῃ
 Εὐξαι τὶ βούλει, πάντα σοὶ γίνεσθαι,
 Ἀγροί, κίχαι, θεραπεύοντις, ἀργυροματά,
 Φίλοι, δικάσται, μαρτυρίαι——

Winds, water, earth, the sun, fire, stars, all these,
 Says Epicharmus, mortals should adore ;
 But I opine, our genuine deities
 Are only silver, and the golden ore :
 For these if once you can propitiate,
 Ask what you will—'tis there in plenteous store—
 Land, houses, servants, services of plate,
 Friends, judges, witnesses.”—

J. L.

1st Corinthians, xv. 32. Φαγόμεν καὶ πινόμεν αὐρίον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν. This sentence has been adduced by some critics, as a sample of quotation from heathen authors, being a maxim of the Epicurean school. But the passage occurs, word for word, in the Septuagint version of the Prophet Isaiah (xxii. 13) who flourished four centuries previously to the times of Epicurus ; and they were used by the Prophet in precisely the same sense and personation, as by the Apostle. If the passage were at all considered as containing an allusion to a heathen composition, I should rather refer it to the epitaph reported to have been inscribed on the monument of Sardanapalus, whose life affords, perhaps, the most instructive example in profane history of the instability and unsatisfactoriness of the pomps and pleasures of sublunary existence. This conjecture does not involve any chronological inconsistency ; and St. Paul may have been familiar with the epitaph ; inasmuch as Sardanapalus is lauded therein, as founder of the Apostle's native city of Tarsus : and the character of the man, being appropriate to the scope of his argument, may, by a natural association, have called to his recollection the inscription itself. The monument, near the city of Anciale, was said to have been crowned by a statue, represented in the act of snapping the fingers, under which was inscribed :

Εσθίε. πινε, παίζε· ὡς τ' ἄλλα τουτου οὐκ ἀξία.

—Aristobulus, apud Athenæ, Deipnosoph, l. 12. p. 530.

The third heathen author whom St. Paul quotes is Epimenides, a poet, prophet, and philosopher, in the time of Solon, and held in great reputation for his wisdom and sanctity.* By his counsel Attica was delivered from a destructive plague, and the Grecian states were instructed to build temples to the gods; for which services he was revered as a god, after his death, and enrolled among the seven wise, by those who exclude Periander. The ever-credulous Pliny asserts, that he lived 299 years, 57 of which glided away while he slumbered in a cavern.

The quotation occurs in Titus, i. 12. Εἶπε τις ἐξ αὐτῶν ἰδίος αὐτῶν Προφῆτης "Κρητὶς αἰεὶ ψευστὰι, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί."† Here the Apostle, warning the bishop of the Cretan church of the deceitful and beast-like character of the Cretans, in corroboration of this caution, adverts to the testimony of Epimenides, contained in his work, Περὶ χρησμῶν; the extant fragments of which are not suited to our purposes of citation.

The Apostle, by calling Epimenides Προφῆτης, does not recognize a divine gift; but only uses the term in its popular acceptance among heathen nations. The Hebrew נביא, the Greek Προφῆτης, and the Latin Vates, were predicated indifferently of a religious teacher, preacher, or predictor, by the New Testament writers, as well as by contemporary classical authors. The word is affirmed by some critics to have been here used, because Epimenides held the sacerdotal office of Προφῆτης, or expounder of the oracle; but I rather conjecture, that this special office did not exist until subsequently to the time of Epimenides. In the earlier ages the terms prophet, priest, and poet, were mutually convertible. The poetic race were esteemed Το γένος θεῖον καὶ ἐνθουσιαστικόν. Plato, two centuries after the times of Epimenides, called them Θεῶν ὕμνους: and truly the severe and alone strength of imagination, exercised in the superior regions of poesy, betokens immortal derivation, and prophetic tendency. For, while elevated on her tower of observation, the scenery immediately around is overlooked, Imagination beholds all the beauty and circumstance of her own creations, receding in endless perspective into the faint outlines of an uncircumscribed horizon. Priests were then the sole depositaries of knowledge, as well as the inculcators of moral truths, which they introduced in a poetic garb: and these truths, considered in their results, contemplated, however darkly, a retributive future. Thus were the characters of prophet, priest, and poet, as it were, identified by oneness of office; and the peculiar excellency of each came to be considered as coexistent attributes of one mind. Thus was poetic genius encircled by a

* Plutarch, in Solon, calls him: Θεοφιλὴ καὶ σοφὸν περὶ τὰ θύια, τὴν ἐνθουσιαστικὴν καὶ τιλαστικὴν σοφίαν.

† Thus says the Scholiast of Lucian, t. 1, p. 3. "Ὁ Ἐπιμεινίδης Κρητὶς τὴν χρεσμολογίαν, ὅν καὶ τὴν, "Κρητὶς αἰεὶ ψευστὰι," λέγοιτο.

gathering halo, which mainly contributed to the unrivalled perfection, and simple grandeur of the earlier Greek classic, by urging the aspirant to agonize for a prize which contained within itself the beautiful, the sacred, the supernatural—the graces of persuasion, the charms of truth, and the talisman of mystery. This, I say, was the form and beauty of the original model, however modified, or sullied, by the fashion of subsequent ages.

JOHN LOCKE.

Newcastle, October, 1834.

ON THE EFFECT OF PROSPECTS OF LIFE AND DEATH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—I must write as one who feels upon this subject, (however deficient I may be in skilfully expressing my feelings,) for the consideration has been forced upon me by my own sickness and recovery.

My Lord's dealing with me in this has, of course, led me to look death in the face; not from extreme manifest danger, but from the token of frailness which is given in any serious sickness. But I have been obliged to face not death only, but now, in recovering, to look upon the probability of *life*, and renewed bodily strength.

The difference of feeling and expression, with which I have looked upon these different events as probable, has struck me much. The thoughts upon them have perplexed, then astonished, and lastly, humbled me; (God grant the humility be genuine;) and as I know that my case is far from singular; and as I have not *seen* an attempt to account for the difference of *feeling* and *expression* with which supposed Christians meet LIFE or DEATH, I have ventured to offer for your EXAMINER a few words upon the subject.

A Christian, when brought low by disease, (or any other depressing circumstance,) generally acknowledges, "it is good for him to be afflicted." He often, when visited by his religious friends, declares his readiness and willingness to leave all that the world can give, to bear all that his Lord pleases to lay upon him. He expresses his confidence that the Lord will manifest his truth and his power in supporting his servant through this trial, and is thankful that God may be glorified in the fire of this painful dispensation. He very often dwells upon the glory of the state into which he is, probably, soon to enter; and especially, upon the delight of doing his Lord's pleasure, without

the temptations of the world, or the clog of the flesh, to hinder. All this is accompanied with unfeigned and unreserved declarations of a sense of utter personal insufficiency and unworthiness. CHRIST is all; His grace is sufficient for these things, his word pledged; THEREFORE, says the Christian, upon his death-bed, *I am confident.*

All who see and hear of the *happy* state of mind of the sufferer, rejoice with him: and if his hopes are *evidently* built upon the right foundation, no one thinks it presumptuous in him to express his confidence; and those who have access to him encourage him in his happy views, and in the expression of them.

But look at a Christian recovering, or who has not been thus afflicted.

Is he now as ready to *declare* his readiness to leave all that the world can give? To bear all (the burden of long and diligent work in the Lord's cause, and of reproach and slight while he so labours) which the Lord may see good to lay upon him? Does he express his confidence that the Lord will manifest his truth and power in supporting his servant through *this* trial? Does he dwell upon the glory of being permitted to labour for that God "whose he is," and who uses earthen vessels to pour out his treasure? Does he now express his conviction that, though incumbered with this clog of the flesh, and surrounded by a host of temptations, yet God's grace is sufficient for him?

Does he, in fact, face life with as much confidence, and expression of confidence, that God will be glorified in him, as he would face death?

I would answer—generally not. And why? Are there less decided promises for life, than for death? No. 1 Peter, iv. 1, 2. 1 Cor. x. 13. Is there less decided evidence of what God has wrought in life? No. Rom. vi. 17, 18; Gal. ii. 20. Did Christ purchase us more declaredly after death, than while in life? No. Rom. xiv. 13, 14; Philip, i. 21. Is the Lord Jesus more *really present* hereafter than here? No. John, xiv. 13. In short, have we less room for *well-founded* confidence in the prospect of a long life, than of a death-bed? No: there is but one hope in either, "My soul fainteth for thy salvation, but I hope IN THY WORD."

If *that word* gives ground of confidence, in a PROMISE to plead and cleave to, then confidence is not presumptuous, nor the declaration of it boasting, either on a death-bed, or in the prospect of long long life. But again, if *that word* gives that ground, and there is an absence of that confidence, or of that declaration of it, (on fit occasions,) what shall we say of him who thus doubts his Lord, and who fears to trust his foot upon THAT SEA, upon which his Lord has walked, and calls him to walk, whether that sea be the valley of the shadow of death, or the course of threescore and ten years in this life?

I will put another question upon the subject which, to me at least, forces a home look, and a humiliating answer.

How comes it that you feel so ready to leave all that the world can give, when you probably can hold these things no longer? How comes it, you are so ready to declare this readiness to your Christian friends, when you do not expect to be put to the trial of having the alternative in your power? Whence is it that you are so ready to bear God's will, when you cannot avoid it; and to cast yourself confidently on God's supporting grace, when your choice of leaning upon anything else is gone? Why do you express your confidence that God will manifest his glory in you, by supporting you in this afflictive dispensation, and will use you in his work of glory where "his servants shall serve him, when again all alternative is removed? Why do you trust that God's grace will be sufficient, when you shall be in a state freed from the body of sin, and without temptation, inclination, or opportunity to sin? Once more, why do you thus boast and glory a total and unreserved surrender of self and all to God, when that boast and glorying is certain to be met with the *approbation* of your Christian friends; and will raise you in the estimation of many, and lower you to none?

Will you make the same boast, can you express the same feelings if you are to live? Your boasting will be *called* presumption by many; your every slip watched and magnified; you will be expected to "live unto the Lord," and you will be abused and mocked, if you do so; your weaknesses will be thrown into a glare of light; your motives will be misunderstood; your actions misrepresented, and the "et cetera" would be infinite. Alas! who is sufficient for these things? Nay, shrink not from the question, there are no obstacles to God; he will do all he has said.

If Jesus died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living: if God has promised, "I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness:" if Paul had reason to be full of expectation that Christ should be magnified in his body, whether it be by life or by death: if the promises of support in *life* are numerous, and the examples of its supply are multiplied in scripture, then is it presumptuous to expect as certain support in life (notwithstanding all the *evident hindrances*) as we should expect in death? Or, is it mere boasting to express that expectation as freely as on a supposed death-bed?

But such an expectation, so expressed, would force us into most *extraordinary* conduct.

Is that an objection? Nay; but bring the question to this: why will I boast and glory that God can and will do a wonder, (because he says he will do it,) when there is no opportunity of the *actual positive fact* being evidenced to the world, or to any one in the world, while I shrink from boasting that God can and will do a wonder, (though he has said it,) when there is oppor-

tunity of the *actual positive fact* being evidenced to the world, or at least, to many in the world?

Does this convict those who are so inconsistent, of one of these two things? Either it arises from *doubt whether God will really fulfil ALL his word*; and therefore, we shrink from boasting, where our stay might, we fear, fail us: or else, we are not inclined, fully and freely, to take God at his word, to exchange the world for the kingdom of God, and to bear the Christian's reproach, and wear the Christian's crown.

The shrinking from the trial of returning health; the *undue* preference of death; the *terror* with which probable prolongation of our stay in this tabernacle, is contemplated by many who have boasted of their death-bed confidence, has led me to think, that even these attempts to draw attention to the subject, may be made profitable by Him, who when the servants pour out water, makes it wine for the refreshing and strengthening of his people. When "to live is Christ," *then* "to die is gain."

"Lord, we believe," and are ready to die; "help thou our unbelief," and make us ready to live.

N. N.

P.S. I hope I have made it appear, as I intend, that I would not cry down death-bed confidence, but stir up to equal confidence, in heart and expression, when the prospect is longer continuance in the body; that, in either case, we should *glory* in the Lord; and so, glorify *him, who CAN shine in our clay here, and make our clay shine hereafter.*

THE FATHERS NOT PAPISTS.*

IN these days of *extremes* in opinion, when that which is of venerable antiquity, or that which is the fresh and vigorous product of recent investigation, gains credit on *these* grounds, rather than from its foundation in truth, and when every one is in danger of becoming a partizan of the ancient or modern school—moreover, as neither party, we think, does fair justice to the views of its opponents, it becomes a very interesting point to determine the value of “authority” in matters of doctrine. It is a question which each must investigate for himself, as all the volumes yet published have failed to settle the controversy. For our own part, we view the matter in the following light: God has vouchsafed us a revelation, which is easy of understanding on all essential points of doctrine or practice. Now, on each and all of these points not requiring peculiar gifts for their comprehension, we hold the authority of any man of very little value; and if he question not the mode, but the existence of such principle, we consider him of no weight at all. Wherever the written word is plain and express, no addition to its imperative claims can be made by the authority of any individual. But on the more recondite points, or, perhaps, even on our mode of belief or exemplification of some established doctrines, some weight should be allowed to authority; the degree of it must be estimated by the character, learning, talents, religious views, &c. of the person in question. In addition, his evidence in support of biblical views would be somewhat affected by the age in which he lived. These circumstances (so briefly noted), when followed out in detail, will, we think, furnish a tolerable rule by which to estimate the claims of any men to authority. It will be observed, that we would place the question on the footing mainly of personal character, allowing little or nothing for their station in the church. At the same time, it is with no slight gratification that we perceive men—great, good, and holy men—in the very early age of the church, before many errors had crept in, holding, in the main, the doctrines now held by Protestants. A reference to the “Fathers,” has ever been the “*ne plus ultra*” of popish argument; and, although we would never allow of this dogma, we are very glad to find that the Fathers were undoubtedly *not Papists*, and all may be convinced of this who will read Mr. Boyd’s book. They will find in St. Chrysostom’s *Oration*s, *Homilies*, &c. abundant evidence that he neither held the supremacy of the pope, auricular confession, depriving the laity

* The Fathers not Papists; or, Six Discourses by the most eloquent Fathers of the Church, with numerous extracts from their writings. Translated from the Greek, by Hugh Stuart Boyd, Esq. Second Edition.

of the wine in the Lord's Supper, transubstantiation, &c. &c.; whilst he and his brethren (extracts from whose works are given) held conspicuously, and luminously, and firmly, the leading doctrines of the Gospel.

This is not all: in the thoughts of these venerable individuals there is a power and majesty, a depth and clearness, a pathos and force, that we rarely meet with among their modern successors. As our object is to give such extracts from Mr. Boyd's volume as will illustrate the character and mode of address of these ancient divines, we will not further detain our readers by prefatory observations.

These discourses abound in distinct views of the Trinity, and in glorious views of the Godhead. Take an example from St. Gregory Nazianzan's Oration on the Nativity:

"God ever was, and is, and will be, or, rather, He ever is. For the terms 'was' and 'will be,' are portions of our fleeting duration and transient nature; but He is always; and thus he designated Himself when He appeared to Moses on the Mount. For He comprehendeth all existence in Himself, without a commencement, without an end; being, as it were, a boundless and unfathomable ocean of existence, rising above every conception both of time and nature. He is shadowed forth by the intellect alone, and that most obscurely and imperfectly; not from the things which are inherent in Him, but from those which move around Him. Ideas, collected from all parts of the creation, conspire to form a faint image of the truth, which escapes before it is seized, and flies before it is understood—beaming for an instant on our mind, as the evanescent lightning glances on our sight—in order, as I suppose, that by the small portion which is comprehended, it may allure us to itself, (for what is wholly incomprehensible is un hoped for and unattempted,) and by what is unapprehended may be admired; and being admired, may be loved the more; and being loved, may purify; and purifying, may render us divine: that when we are thus transformed, when we are become, as it were, His family, He may associate with us—(my words are somewhat daring)—a God united unto gods, and apprehended by them—apprehended, perhaps, as much as they now are known! We may, therefore pronounce that God is infinite and difficult to be contemplated; and that the only thing respecting Him which may fully be comprehended is His infinity. But since some one may consider, that a being which is simple in its nature must be either perfectly intelligible or wholly unintelligible, let us inquire what it is to be of a simple nature. The nature of a simple being does not consist wholly in its simplicity, as the nature of a compound being does not merely depend upon its being compounded. Infinity may be considered in two respects, with reference both to the beginning and to the end; for that which is beyond these, and not that which inheres in these, constitutes infinity. When the mind looks back on the abyss of past duration, not knowing where it may firmly root itself, in its contemplation of the Deity, it calls this infinite and unimpassable abyss, unoriginated duration; and when it looks forward to the future, it calls it immortal and imperishable; and when it unites the two, it denominates the whole eternal. Eternity is

neither time nor any portion of time, for it is not possible that it can be measured; but that which to us is time, measured by the course of the sun, is eternity to an Eternal Essence, being extended, as it were, so as to be commensurate to its existence. Thus far have I philosophized on the nature of Deity. The time admitteth not of protracted investigation; for the subject which I have proposed unto myself is not the existence of God, but the economy of grace. Let me, however, add, that when I speak of God, I speak of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. To extend the Divine Essence further, would be to introduce a multitude of Gods; and if we should circumscribe it more, we should be impoverishing the fulness of the Godhead. The one is heathenish, the other Jewish: danger is situate in both, although found in opposite extremes. This is that Holy of Holies which is overshadowed by seraphic wings, and glorified in three sanctities, blended in one domination and in one Divinity."

After dilating upon the wonderful creation of man, and mourning over his fall and sinful condition, Gregory advances to the amazing plan of redemption, and appears lost in adoration at God's surpassing love. He says:

"As, then, things needed a greater remedy they obtained a greater. This was He, the Word of God—He, the Everlasting, the Invisible, the Uncircumscribable, the Incorporeal, the Light outbeaming from the Light, the Beginning proceeding from the Beginning; the Fountain of Life and Immortality, the Impress of the all-beauteous Archetype, the Indelible Character, the Unvarying Image, the Word of the Father, commensurate to His illimitable nature. He approaches unto his own image; to redeem my body; He is invested with a body; to redeem my soul, He unites himself to a rational soul, that by human nature, human nature may be purified. In every respect, save only in respect of sin, He becomes a man, and is born of a virgin previously purified by the Spirit in soul and body. As God assumes this nature in the moment of its creation, and thereby prevents its individual subsistence, from two contrarious natures, human and divine, one Christ is formed; and of these, the one was stamped with divinity, and the other impressed that divinity upon it. O unprecedented union! O ineffable conjunction! The Everliving begins to be; the Uncreate is formed; the Infinite is circumscribed: He is circumscribed by a rational soul, the intervening link which connects the incorporeal nature of God with the grossness of a material form. He who inheriteth the riches of the universe is rendered poor; He is clothed with the garment of my flesh, that I may be enriched with the treasures of His Godhead. He who is full of blessedness is emptied; yea, for a little season He is emptied of His glory, that I may participate for ever in his fulness. Oh! what an exuberance of the riches of His goodness! And what is this mystery by which I am affected? I partook of the Celestial Image, and I did not preserve it. He participates in my lowly flesh, that he may not only restore the image, but make this flesh immortal. He is associated with me in a second participation, more august and more astonishing than the first; for then he imparted that which was superior to my nature; now he partakes of that which is inferior to his

dignity. This is more godlike than the other: in the eyes of all who can understand, this will shine with a more transcending lustre."

We shall now give an extract from the 16th chapter of St. Basil's treatise on the Spirit, where he has been showing that in every divine operation, the Spirit is inseparable from the Father and the Son:

"No one can call Jesus Lord, except in the power of the Spirit; and no one speaking in the Spirit can call Jesus accursed. But the rebellious and unholy angels did so, which confirms our doctrine, that the potentates invisible are equally propense to virtue and to wickedness, and therefore need the assistance of the Spirit. Never will I believe that Gabriel himself could prophesy the future, save only in the prescience of the Spirit; since prophecy is among the gifts that he distributes. How could the seraphim repeat, "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord," unless instructed by the Spirit how often it were suitable to chant that mystic melody? If, then, the seraphic chorus resound their Creator's glory, it is by the energy of the Spirit. If thousands of angels, and myriads of archangels stand by the throne adoring, in the power of the Spirit irreproachably they perform their office. All those supernal strains and heavenly warblings, whether poured in open ministration before the throne, or breathed in the unobtrusive symphonies of supramundane powers, would die on immortal lips, if unassisted by the Spirit."

Again, he observes in the homily on the Catholic faith:

"The Spirit is enthroned in heaven, but He pervades the earth; He is every where present, and by no bounds is He circumscribed. In each point of space He is altogether present, and yet He is altogether enthroned in heaven. Not as one who is subservient, does he administer gifts, but of his own will He dispenses blessings, for saith the scripture, 'He distributes unto each according as it pleases Him.' He is sent forth, with reference to the economy of redemption, but with inherent might He operates.

"Let us pray that He may be ever present to our souls, and may never fail us. Let us pray that He may be present through the grace of Christ our Lord, unto whom be ascribed the glory and the power for ever and ever. Amen."

It would be very useless for us to comment upon these magnificent conceptions; so solemn in their wide outstretching grandeur, and so simply in accordance with God's word. But it is deeply interesting to see the view which these glorious spirits take of the privileges of Christians in approaching the all-seeing and all-creating One they have shadowed forth. Oh! how shall we whose apprehensions, even imperfect as they must be, can embrace such an *idea* of God, vast in its reality, and yet more awe-inspiring in its felt inadequacy, how can we who are but sinful dust and ashes, draw near with hope to Him, the Uncreate, the Holy! The way has been revealed to us; the diffi-

culties have been removed; the mountain of sin has been cast into the sea, and through the Son we may call God our Father, and obtain the blessings of the inheritance. Oh! that we fully appreciated the privilege and the benefit of prayer—its power with God, its power in our own souls. How exquisite the following passage from St. Chrysostom!

"Prayer is a haven to the shipwrecked mariner, an anchor unto them that are sinking in the waves, a staff to the limbs that totter, a mine of jewels to the poor, a security to the rich, a healer of disease, and a guardian of health. Prayer at once secures the continuance of our blessings, and dissipates the cloud of our calamities. Do temptations assail us? Oh, how easily are they repelled. If we are afflicted by loss of fortune, or by any other of those ills which are written in the dark catalogue of human sufferings, do we not rise superior to them all? O prayer, O blessed prayer, how shall I pourtray thee? Thou art the unwearied conqueror of human woes, the firm foundation of human happiness, the source of everduring happiness, the mother of philosophy! The man who can pray truly, though languishing in extremest penury, is richer than all beside; while the wretch who never bowed the knee, though proudly seated as monarch of the nations, is of all men most indigent. Ahab was a king, and his treasures of gold and silver were too numerous to be counted; but possessing not the gift of prayer, he went about to seek Elias, a man who had scarce a pillow on which to rest his head, and whose only garment was a squalid sheepskin. What prodigy is this? Inform me, thou that inheritest mountains of gold, seekest thou the poor, the contemned Elias? I do, saith he, for what benefit can I derive from my treasured store when he shutteth up the windows of heaven, and rendereth nature's gifts unfruitful?—And now, my brethren, do not we understand how much more abundantly this man was gifted than the other? As long as he continued silent, the monarch and his army were a prey to want. Oh! wondrous sight! he possessed nothing upon earth, yet his influence extended to the skies. For this reason he could bar the portals of heaven, because he had nothing upon earth. His poverty was here—his treasures there. Opening his lips, alone, he caused unnumbered blessings to descend. O voice, commanding the springs of the rain! O tongue, unloosing the fetters of the cloud! O mouth, distilling with the dews of heaven! To him, then, our thoughts directing, to him who was poor, yet rich, rich because that he was poor, let us overlook the enjoyments of the present, and desire the blessings of the future; for so shall we obtain the blessings both of the present and the future. Oh! may we all obtain them, through the grace and beneficence of Christ our Lord, to whom, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, be ascribed all glory, now and evermore! Amen."

It were easy to multiply such passages to a great extent—they abound everywhere throughout the whole work. Our only difficulty arises from the "*embarras des richesses*;" when so many extracts of excelling beauty, and amazing power, offer themselves, it is not easy to make our choice. Many of the passages from St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, and St. Gregory, are of

unequalled majesty and thrilling pathos: they resemble the sun going forth in his strength, or the gentle ministrations of the dew-drop; now they mount on eagle-wing towards "high heaven," and again they melt with the glow of human feeling. At times they seem to have advanced almost beyond human perfection in their Christian career, and we almost lose sight of them, until we seek them at the foot of the cross.

But it may be well to prove from their works, their freedom from errors, introduced subsequently by the Romish church, and sanctioned by some great names.

In some of the extracts already given, it will be seen that stress is laid upon the "One Mediator between God and man," the only mode of approach to Him "who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity." Although reverence and honor—perhaps verging toward the extreme—are paid to the Virgin Mother, yet in no place is she exalted above humanity, save in the honor conferred upon her; in no part is she viewed as an intercessor with the Son; nor is there a trace of worship supposed to be due to her.

Still less did they attribute power to man, however sanctified and purified he might be by God's grace; they had too low a sense of their own attainments, to fancy the prevalence of their intercessions, based on their own merits. That St. Chrysostom was not a Papist, may be proved by referring to his interpretation of Matt. xvi. 18, in his homily on St. Matthew. Other references to him amply confirm this; for example, in a sermon on the propagation of the Gospel, he speaks of John and Peter cast into prison; and after alluding to them as mere agents, he inquires, in what consisted their power over the minds of their hearers? manifestly in the truths which they proclaimed, and not in the instruments:

"When they were at length convinced," says he, "that the Gospel was established daily, that it had risen more glorious than the sun, and that when it first beamed upon the horizon, it had evinced that it would gain a subject world, they trembled at its power; they feared two captives whom they had ensnared, whom they had accused, whom they had scourged; they feared two fishermen, the outcasts of society."

Not a word here of the supremacy of Peter over the other Apostle; not a word of apostolic authority, as distinct from the truths enforced by apostolic agency.

Again, with regard to transubstantiation, St. Chrysostom says:

"Since, therefore, the Word has said, 'This is my body,' let us be persuaded of it, let us believe it truly, let us behold it with *intellectual* eyes: for Christ hath committed to us nothing which is perceptible to sense; but under a *form perceptible*, things *intellectually discerned* are given. Thus, also, in baptism, the gift is conferred upon us by means of a perceptible substance, to wit, the water; but the regeneration which is effected is inwardly discerned. If thou hadst been made an incorporeal spirit, He

would have given the same unto thee revealed in its native form; but since thy soul is united to a body, he bestows on thee a gift intellectually perceived, in a *form* perceptible to sense."

Upon which Mr. Boyd acutely remarks:

"It might seem, from the first sentences, that St. Chrysostom held transubstantiation; but what is said about *baptism absolutely demonstrates* that he held no such thing. Baptism is here considered a case parallel to the Lord's Supper. But no one will maintain, that any but a spiritual change takes place in baptism. The *whole passage* annihilates the Popish doctrine."

In his Homily on the Priesthood, St. Chrysostom, after speaking of the importance of priestly duties, and the impediments which obstruct the word, and render a frequent repetition of instruction necessary, says,

"Of the sins which are committed (by the flock under his care), not a thousandth part can become known to him; for how can he be acquainted with their sins, to whose faces, for the most part, he is utterly a stranger?"

Clearly, then, St. Chrysostom was ignorant of auricular confession. Again, speaking of the discipline to be observed towards communicants, and the necessity of not administering unworthily, he observes:

"I will yield up this mortal body, or e'er I will impart the body of my Lord unworthily. I will pour out my blood upon the earth, or e'er I will impart unlawfully that sacred blood."

From this passage it is evident that he held that the "cup of the Lord" might be lawfully imparted; but the Romish church deny this, and therefore differ from those ancient Fathers, to whom they refer so confidently. We might multiply quotations, but we think enough has been adduced to prove the point at issue, that the Fathers were not Papists.

That errors in doctrine speedily crept into the church, and that these errors contained in themselves many of the germs of popery, we do not in the least doubt. Some of the causes of these erroneous views have been ably investigated by Turretin of Geneva, and their remedies pointed out. We shall extract a paragraph from his oration; but we recommend a perusal of the whole to our readers. After enumerating the various sources of false doctrine, he proceeds:

"If, now, any person would ask, what is to be done to purify Christianity, or where it is pure to keep it so? I will give my answer in but one word, since it may easily be adduced from what I have already said—Adhere to the word of God alone. Surrender not one point to human authority, nor to human philosophy, nor to human eloquence, nor to learned individuals, nor to bodies of learned men, nor to pomp, nor to splendour, in the affairs of religion. Learn with diligence the languages in which the word of God was written, and which throw light on its pages. Carefully attend to the art of interpretation; but be sure that it be the true and genuine art. Avoid the too subtle, allegorical, and rash expositors of the sacred writings. Avoid

the heated minds which are ever searching for the wonderful and exaggerate whatever they handle. Avoid especially the lust, the pride, the envy, the hatred, the quarrels, the factions, the tyranny of learned men, which have been the greatest plagues of Christianity. Let neither princes nor pastors, neither clergymen nor laymen, transgress the bounds of their office, nor abuse their authority. Avoid dignities, avoid riches, avoid the manners of the world, which corrupt the church. Lastly, and chiefly, fix this deeply in your minds, that it is neither genius, nor penetration, nor words, nor syllables, nor dogmas, nor external rights, and least of all, is it a *bitter spirit*, veiled beneath the title of zeal for the glory of God; but a holy, pious life, formed upon the example of God himself, that makes a man a Christian."—See *Congregational Magazine* for November, 1834.

We shall conclude our extracts by giving one from St. Chrysostom's second panegyric on the Apostle Paul:

"One thing he feared and dreaded—to offend God; and he had no other fear. So, also, there was nothing so desirable unto him as to please his Lord: and I speak not of present things, but of things yet futura. Tell me not of cities and nations, of kings and armies, of empire, and wealth, and power; for the spider's airy mansion was more substantial in his eyes. But think of his celestial glories, and then you may conceive the fervour of his love to Christ. Compared with the magic of that charm, he admired not the dignity of the angels, or the archangels, or any created power; for in his bosom he had something greater—the love of Christ. Possessing this, he deemed himself the most blessed of mankind; devoid of this, he sighed not for worldly dignities, but rather chose, possessed of this love, to be the lowest of the indigent, than, destitute of this, to sit on the pinnacle of grandeur. For him there was one punishment—to lose this love: this was his affliction, this his torment, this his hell, this an abyse of misery. Unto him there was one enjoyment—to experience this love; this was his life, this his world, this his angel, this was time, this was eternity, this the kingdom, this the promise, this a mine of blessings. Whatever was irrelevant to this he considered rather painful nor delectable. All sublunary things he regarded as the herb that perisheth. The rage of tyrants, and the fury of the multitude were, to him, the murmuring of insects, and afflictions, and chastisements, and death, he looked upon as the sports of children, save when he suffered them in the cause of Christ—these, even these he embraced with joy."

We think that Mr. Boyd has conferred a permanent benefit on the Christian church, by placing within the reach of English readers such a mass of profound thought; and although there are opinions which we think erroneous, still they form so small a proportion, compared with the orthodox and invaluable portions, that it does not prevent our strenuous recommendation of the work to all our friends.

We take leave of Mr. Boyd with unfeigned sentiments of respect and gratitude. We should be delighted to see another volume of similar extracts, and as well executed, from his pen.

THOUGHTS ON ETERNAL DURATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—It is a most interesting subject of inquiry, as connected with our future state, what the nature of duration will be, when time shall be no more. Is eternity, it has been often asked, a never-ending prolongation of time, the same in kind, and differing only as the whole from a part? This question some have not hesitated to answer in the negative; but I cannot say that the reasonings upon which their conclusion is founded, have carried conviction to my own mind. That argument, in particular, which is derived from the supposed impossibility of an infinite succession of equal periods, has always appeared to me utterly unphilosophical.

There is another question, however, of equal importance, as regards ourselves, namely, whether our perception of duration will continue unaltered; and, in answer to this inquiry, it is not so difficult to propose a probable conjecture. My own belief is, that our apprehension of duration will cease with our present state: and the following are the considerations upon which this opinion is founded.

Our notion of duration is suggested by reflection upon the train of our ideas, and is derived so exclusively from this source that, when the ideal succession is interrupted, we are no longer conscious of the lapse of time. When the mind entirely loses its ideas, as in sleep, and when it is occupied by one alone, to the exclusion of all others, the flow of time is unobserved. There is yet another way in which the ideal train, and, with it, our perception of duration, may cease to exist—by such an expansion, namely, of our mental capacity as will enable us to possess and contemplate all our ideas, not as now, singly and successively, but simultaneously and at once. That such will be our intellectual constitution in a more perfect state, I think in the highest degree probable. Indeed, the inability to direct our thoughts to more than one object at the same time, is so obviously a part of our present low and unsatisfactory condition, as to leave little room to doubt that this limitation will be removed, together with the other imperfections of our present state. If Locke's conjecture respecting the faculty of memory in superior intelligences, be not improbable, I know not why we may not extend the same thought a little farther, and apply it to the disembodied spirits of just men made perfect. If, then, our ideas, which now progress in succession through our minds, and are therefore divided into past, present, and to come, are in a future state to coexist, and form one united object of mental contemplation, I conceive that, *ipso facto*, our perception of duration

will vanish, together with the ideal train from which it is now derived.

Many objections to the supposition here proposed, will, I doubt not, at first view suggest themselves; but these will, I think, for the most part be found to arise from a misapprehension of a mode of existence, so foreign to all that we have hitherto experienced or conceived. To some perhaps it may appear that a state of being, in which the past and future have become present to the mind, in which memory has no occasion to recall, nor anticipation to conjecture and predict, in which there is nothing to expect, nothing to look forward to; that such an existence would soon pall upon the mind of man, athirst as it is for novelty, variety, and the excitement of unexpected incident, and, in whose regard, pleasure no longer pleases, when it ceases to be new. But this objection, be it observed, is founded on the supposition, that our feeling of duration will still cleave to us in a future state. It implies that time will still be apprehended by us, nay, that we shall perceive it to fly with leaden wings. For what is weariness, what sameness, what the tiresome uniformity of a monotonous existence, if we abstract from them the perception of time? These notions are inseparably connected with our idea of duration, and can have no place in a state of being where this is refused admittance.

Some may think it an infringement upon the attributes of Him whose all-seeing eye penetrates through every moment of duration, no less than through every district of space, to suppose the recesses of the past, and the secrets of the future, thus laid open to our view. The theory, however, which I have been considering, would leave our limited capacities at the same immeasurable distance which now separates them from the infinite mind of that being "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." It does not of necessity imply, that the range of our perceptions will be extended, or the boundaries of our knowledge enlarged. It has reference, not to the extent or number of our ideas, but to our manner of perceiving them. It supposes, not that we shall know and perceive such and such things, but that our knowledge and perceptions will cease to be presented to us consecutively and in detail, and will be exhibited in one vast and undivided mental panorama.

For my own part, I do not think that this theory supposes a greater expansion of our faculties, than is implied in the common notions of our eternal state. None can imagine that, in the future life, all remembrance of our earthly pilgrimage will vanish from our minds; still less, that each successive century or thousand years, throughout the countless ages of eternity, will obliterate all previous recollections from our memories. How little such a total oblivion of all that we have thought, felt, and been, would differ from a loss of personal identity, may deserve consideration. If, then, these suppositions are utterly inconceivable; if our recollections are to adhere to us through the interminable

length of never-ending duration ; what a change must take place in our retentive faculty ! Those tablets of the memory, from which a few short years are now sufficient to erase characters the most deeply graven, are, hereafter, to preserve their impressions indelible, through the revolving periods of an inexhaustible eternity. This consequence, I say, inevitably follows from the received opinions upon this subject ; and whether it be much easier of conception than the conjecture which has been offered for consideration, I leave to be determined.

Such speculations, I am aware, appear to some minds unprofitable, and even presumptuous. Any desire to extend our inquiries beyond the limits of this present scene, and, in imagination, to anticipate the nature of that heavenly state in which we hope ere long to have our being, is regarded as a vain, idle, and dangerous curiosity. With this opinion I am far from coinciding. Speculations upon a question of such paramount interest, can scarcely be deemed unprofitable ; nor can they be justly termed presumptuous, so long as they are conducted with the moderation and humility, suitable to so high and sacred a subject.

The language of holy writ appears to afford strong confirmation of this opinion. The manner in which the future state is spoken of in the sacred volume, seems to me calculated to stimulate, and therefore intended to authorize, speculations upon that subject. Had the nature and circumstances of our future life been clearly revealed to us, supposition and conjecture would have been at an end : while, on the other hand, a total silence on this head would have afforded a presumption that the subject was a mystery into which we were forbidden to scrutinize. These suppositions are equally opposed to truth. Information on this most interesting subject is not afforded in such abundance, or with such clearness, as to satisfy curiosity ; neither is it so entirely withheld as to discountenance or repress it. It is not in the clear light of day, nor yet in the obscurity of midnight darkness, that the magic wand of fancy conjures up its imaginary combinations. For, as a brilliant illumination which reveals every object in its just proportions, dispels the illusions of imagination ; so, in total darkness, are wanting those half-seen forms and shadowy outlines which are necessary to give verisimilitude to its representations. It is when a glimmering and deceptive twilight half conceals, and half discloses, the surrounding scene, that fancy finds materials fitted for its airy and fantastic fabrics. In like manner, the light which revelation throws upon the circumstances of our future state, while it is insufficient to render speculation unnecessary, is yet strong enough to afford scope and matter for its inquiries and conjectures.

G. H. W.

REPLY TO A CONNAUGHT CURATE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR,—May I request the insertion of the following remarks in answer to an article, signed by your well-known and talented correspondent, "A Connaught Curate," in your number for May, 1834. When I heard of a parallel having been drawn between Millenarians and Romanists, whom I had ever believed and still believe to be wide as the poles asunder, I confess I was much surprised, and really desirous to see the article written in proof of it. It will be necessary for me first to remark, that I am not one of those whom he has designated "*the perfect*," i. e. I am a Millenarian, without adopting universal salvation, "an infallible tribunal," or seeing the absolute necessity for spiritual gifts in this dispensation, or literal sacrifices in the next. Had the Connaught Curate contented himself with strongly reprobating those errors into which "*the perfect*" may have fallen, wherever I did not conceive he had misrepresented their tenets, he should have had in me a feeble, but zealous coadjutor; but when he asserts that the doctrines of the Millennium, as held even by those who are generally styled *moderate*, or, as he styles them, "*babes in reference to it*," and the interpretation they give to texts in order to support their views of it, are stated necessarily to lead to Popery, I think it the duty of those (who, while they hold Millennial views, yet would shrink from most of the consequences he draws from them, as from the face of a serpent,) to come forward and point out that the views they hold do not necessarily lead to such conclusions, however humble may be their talents, or low their standing in the church. Before proceeding to an analysis of the Connaught Curate's letter, I would observe, that his mode of argument, through the whole of it, appears to me quite unfair, and such as though, from the prejudices against the doctrine which exist in the mind of many, it may be admitted by them on this subject, they would repudiate as applied to any other portion of controverted truth. However I may, therefore, admire the ingenuity of the Connaught Curate, I cannot admit that his line of argument has any thing of novelty to recommend it, as it appears to me to be similar to the old argument drawn from the abuse made of the doctrines of grace by Antinomians against the professors of the doctrines of grace themselves, the legalists; because men, who have taken up the doctrines of grace, have sometimes flown off to Antinomian licentiousness, and quote the texts generally quoted by believers in God's free salvation in support of their delusion, are too ready, as we know, to charge all who hold the truth as it is in Jesus as Antinomians; and assert the very same reason the "Connaught Curate" does for charging moderate Mil-

lenarians with the errors of those who have given the rein to fancy, and followed the dictates of a heated imagination, rather than the sound words of God, namely, that the text they quote to prove salvation by grace, in their interpretation of them, necessarily lead to Antinomianism. I am persuaded, however, that though the adversary may not perceive the distinction, that I need not tell the Editor of the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, or the "Connaught Curate," that those passages do admit of an interpretation fully bearing out the believer in free grace, while at the same time they discountenance Antinomian error.

Having said this much as to my view of his general line of argument, I proceed to show that the passages he adduces may be interpreted by Millenarians in accordance with their views, without necessarily including the errors into which the "Connaught Curate" asserts the perfect have fallen—just as the doctrines of grace may be held without falling into Antinomian heresy. The first error, as stated by the "Connaught Curate," is universal salvation, which he is pleased to compare with purgatory. I leave it to those who hold the doctrine to show, (which, with all my antipathy to the doctrine, I believe they can show,) that there is a marked difference between them; but here I must first put one query to the "Connaught Curate." Is this a doctrine confined to Millenarians? Are there not many who hold it who would fully agree with the "Connaught Curate" in all his bitterness against a personal reign? If so, then, may not we turn on him, and say that his views as necessarily lead to the same issue? But to come to the only Scripture he has quoted on this head, Rom. viii. 21. The "Connaught Curate" assumes that all Millenarians interpret the whole creation as meaning, or at least including, all mankind. Now, I rather think that the creation here spoken of is exclusive of man. My reasons are, first, because it is said to be made subject to vanity not willingly, which description, I do not apprehend, applies to man, as man, spoken of in the sense the passage would require. If man be the creation spoken of *did* fall, and become subject to vanity *willingly*, in a certain sense, individuals may be said to be made subject not willingly, but as *mankind* they fell willingly in Adam.

Secondly, There is a distinction drawn between the creation which is represented as expecting the manifestation of the sons of God, and the sons of God whose manifestation is expected, as well as between the creature and those who are represented as having the first-fruits of the Spirit. This overthrows the "Connaught Curate's" novel interpretation of the text, which is not to be found in any of the commentaries I have been able to search, though Anti-Millenarians, namely, Scott, Henry, and Whitby, who all, applying it to man in general, come much more under the censure of the "Connaught Curate," as holding views of the text which lead to universal salvation; and yet I believe none of the three have ever been charged with it. The meaning

which I believe, in common with many others of the weaker brethren, to be the true one of the passage is as follows: that St. Paul would prove his assertion that the sufferings, &c., were not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed from this, that that must be a great glory which not only the saints, but all creation, groaned in travail for; and that he takes occasion to remark, that the creature, though made subject to vanity unwillingly, yet would itself partake of the glory of the manifestation of the sons of God. The word *κτίσις* occurs in the first chapter, as the visible creation; and it is to this we refer the word. As to the strange interpretation of the "Connaught Curate," who would put *new* before creation, without any warrant, and speaks of it as if it was the ascertained meaning generally received of the passage, all I can say with respect to it is to refer him to the paper of "J. D. S." on the subject in the *Christian Herald*.

It appears to me, Mr. Editor, that the error of universal salvation arises not from the holding of Millenarian views, but from men of different opinions on this point, but who agree in universal redemption, which would be a great deal easier proved to necessarily lead to universal salvation, than any Millenarian interpretation of Rom. viii. I know particular redemption is a doctrine not much suited to the taste of the present day; but though I hold it, and cannot see any thing to rest on between it and universal salvation, I won't retort upon the "Connaught Curate."

I now proceed to the second head of the "Connaught Curate," where, because Millenarians hold that miracles ought to be in the, or rather, may be restored to the church; and some have actually fancied that they are in the church; he therefore concludes we are fallen into another Romish error. It does not appear to me that our controversy with the Romanists ever went so far as to deny that miracles might be restored to the church; our only objection was to the so-called miracles of Rome, and their assuming them as an infallible test of the true church, so much so as to count that wherever miracles were, there was truth. We object to making miracles the test of truth, instead of trying the miracle-workers by the test of God's word. I am not about to defend those who are deluded, (as I believe they are who think miracles have been restored,) but I cannot fly into the opposite extreme of Sadducean unbelief, and assert that miracles may not be restored. But to come to the passage which he quotes as necessarily leading us to the Romish error, Joel ii. 28. He asserts that though this has been stated to be fulfilled by Peter on the day of Pentecost, yet that Millenarians, by declaring it yet unfulfilled, they necessarily fall into the expectation of miracles being wrought in their Millennium. If, as he asserts, the passage refers to their supposed Millennium, it ought to be a preservative against looking for miraculous powers in the present dispensation. But again I would ask the "Connaught Curate," can he

interpret the words of Peter so as to prevent the application of the prophecy of Joel to the other effusions of the Holy Spirit which took place subsequent to the Pentecostal, i. e. upon Cornelius; and if he cannot, then he and his opponents argue in the same manner. The "Connaught Curate" says this began to be fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, and went on fulfilling for some time after. The others say this was the beginning of a pouring out of the Spirit to be the privilege of the church during the dispensation it opened; and though now the manifestation has ceased, (as the visible manifestation of God's presence did to the Jews,) yet it may be restored, as it was among the Jews, at the close of their dispensation.

I have entered thus far upon this subject, as desirous of taking in the views of all moderate Millenarians; my own opinion being that there is a double fulfilment of that, as well as of many other prophecies; and that the passage in Joel evidently points out to a period different from that in which its first fulfilment is spoken of as having taken place in Acts ii. 10, for which I would refer the "Connaught Curate" to verses 30 and 31 in the 2d chapter of Joel; and as this manifestly refers to the great day of the Lord, I believe that in that great day, at the commencement of a new and close of an old dispensation, that the signs and wonders will especially be vouchsafed. I need, I think, add no more on this head: that miracles have ceased is admitted—that they have so ceased *for ever* is denied. Romanists *say they have not ceased*: they profess to have them. I am ready to examine their miracles, but deny that they are proofs of the true church, even if admitted to be miracles, as I find another system spoken of in Scripture, as coming with miracles, and signs, and lying wonders; but I certainly shall not turn infidel for fear of being a Papist, as my friend the "Connaught Curate" appears to wish us to do. I trust, therefore, in this, as well as in the first head, I have established anything but a parallel between Millenarians and Romanists.

As to his third head, the infallible tribunal, first, I never put the *cui bono* question to the all-wise God, as it is rather dangerous; but if it was put now, I think a much better answer would be given by Millenarians than that put into their mouths by the "Connaught Curate," displaying the truth of the proverb, "He that don't love me, sha'n't tell my tale." However, as he has not given any text which we, weaker brethren, so interpret as necessarily to lead us into the deplorable error he mentions in a "perfect brother," I have no occasion to write on this point. I should indeed be glad of an infallible tribunal to settle the disputes between me and the "Connaught Curate," but I believe I have it in the Bible rightly understood by the teaching of the Holy Spirit; and I believe most Millenarians uphold the authority of that word as a judge of controversies, and hold that we would do well to take heed to it "as to a light shining in a dark place," much more than those on the opposite side of the question; but I cannot but say there appears a considerable difference

even on the "Connaught Curate's" own version of his conversation with one of "the perfect," between Romanists and Millenarians. I think I might say to the "Connaught Curate," just as well you are nearly allied to Popery; for you believe that there is an infallible tribunal and judge of controversies, and so do the Papists; but yours is the Bible, theirs is the church. Thus even his own difference from Rome is, like the perfect, only in the seat of infallibility.

The last error into which the "Connaught Curate" declares Millenarians have fallen is, the restoration of daily sacrifices. These, he says, we are to admit, in consequence of our application of texts to the millennial period which have already been fulfilled at the restoration of the Jews from Babylon. For instance, Ezekiel's temple, and the worship there spoken of. Now, I ask the "Connaught Curate" one question; are the Millenarians the only people who apply the passages to a yet future restoration? Is he himself satisfied as to their fulfilment at the restoration from Babylon? If he be, let him give forth to the church any connected view of the latter chapters of Ezekiel. If it is a fulfilled prophecy, surely it is easy to show how it has been fulfilled. There are multitudes who join in the opposition to the Personal reign, who still hold (though I think inconsistently) the restoration of the Jews; a point scarcely doubted in the church till the controversy about the Millennium question arose, and men, through enmity to the Personal advent, changed their views of Jewish restoration. The sober-minded Millenarian says, with respect to these things, this is an unfulfilled prophecy: it looks like a restoration of literal sacrifices. Many Millenarians do not hold such to be the case; but I certainly cannot see any foundation for the charge of Popery, endeavoured to be fastened on Millenarians by the "Connaught Curate," as the church of Rome asserts that there is now a sacrifice *for sin*; this I nor the "Connaught Curate" never heard stated by any Millenarian, however wild, though they might hold that the sacrifices of beasts, &c. may be found in the restored Jewish nation, not as propitiatory for sin, but sacramental rites, whereby our attention, or rather the thoughts of the worshipping believer, in the restored Jewish nation, may be recalled to the great sacrifice once offered on the cross of Calvary. I have never considered our controversy with the church of Rome, relative to the Mass, to hinge on the point of the Eucharist being a sacrifice. Nay, I thought that we admitted it as a *spiritual* sacrifice; but I always conceived our opposition to Rome arose from their stating it to be a *sacrifice for sin*, which no Millenarian believes ever to have existed in the Jewish nation, nor expects in it when restored. It would be well, indeed, that some Millenarians did not dogmatize (as men on all sides are prone to do) on this matter, as, in prophecies confessedly unfulfilled, we must be content to examine these by analogy, drawn from prophecies already fulfilled, and to take them as a light shining in a dark

place, *till* the day dawn, and the day-star arise in our hearts. There is, however, one text quoted, as driving the Millenarians to adopt literal sacrifices, Rev. v. 10; I don't see how this compels us to adopt them, though we interpret it literally, "Thou hast made us to our God kings and priests," is something stated as belonging to the saints, even before their reign on the earth, which is declared, in the close of the passage, to be yet their expectation: "We shall reign on the earth." Just as St. Peter calls them a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ; and while I hold this view, I don't see how it militates against my taking the latter clause of the verse in its literal meaning, "We shall reign on the earth." Nor did I ever see a satisfactory explanation given of the latter clause of the verse, but that which referred it to the period of millennial blessedness, when the meek shall inherit the earth.

There are, at the close of the "Connaught Curate's" communication, or rather I should call it accusation, a few more charges brought against millenarian interpretation of the Scripture. The first is, their not applying the character of the Man of Sin, in Thessalonians, to the Papacy: many Millenarians do so interpret it; for instance, W. D., who has written many papers (I believe in your periodical) to prove it. But here again I must ask the "Connaught Curate," has he never met anti-millennial expositors, and they, too, strong and strenuous opposers of the church of Rome, who did not apply this passage to Rome? Has he ever read Whitby on the passage? If not, I would advise him to peruse his Commentary on the ii. of 2 Thessalonians, and see whether if this be an error, it is one that is to be found *only* among Millenarians. I know no Millenarian who does not apply the apostacy mentioned in 1 Timothy, iv. 1, to the church of Rome; nor any who, while they declare that the passage in 2 Thessalonians has an ultimate reference to the Antichrist, will not apply the names therein given to him to the church of Rome. As both the apostacy and the Man of Sin proceed from the same parent, and possess naturally a family resemblance, and the general belief of the Millenarians, with whom I am acquainted, is that as there is Christ personal, and Christ mystical, so there is Antichrist personal, whom they yet expect, and Antichrist mystical, who is now manifested in the soul-destroying system of the Papacy. While, therefore, I agree with the "Connaught Curate," that there is much to deplore in many who have professed the doctrine of the Millennium as a portion of their creed, I trust the prospect is not so gloomy, with respect to the turning over to Popery, as the "Connaught Curate" would represent it; but that, though many may appear to him verging towards that hateful system, they will be found, on impartial inquiry, not only not to have bowed the knee to the image of Baal, but ready to testify against it both in public and in private. I have confessed myself a Millenarian, in the com-

mon acceptance of the word, and I now confess myself equally ready with the "Connaught Curate," to banish and drive away the strange doctrines and abominable practices of Rome's apostacy; and though I may not be able to do this with as much power as he is known to possess, I trust the Lord may give me grace to do it with equal zeal and equal boldness.

Believe me yours,

A MAYO CURATE.

ON THE MERCY OF GOD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

SIR—Fully and freely do I agree with the sentiments expressed so well by J. P. S. on the *mercy* of God. To the very letter I coincide with him when he declares, that of all the attributes of the Godhead, not one is so generally, so awfully mistaken as this attribute. Men are ready enough to acknowledge themselves sinners, but not such sinners as to merit the "blackness of darkness for ever." Their sins, they say, are infirmities, are failings; and which of us, even the best of us, is exempt from them? And then, God is a merciful God, he willeth not that any should perish, and he will, of course, overlook them. Never, alas! beholding the Godhead as it is. Never enduring to view it surrounded and guarded with a *Justice* that will exact to the utmost its demands—with a Truth that will have its threats fulfilled to the last tittle; neither of them permitting their prerogative to be violated, their frontiers to be passed. Mercy, indeed, stands with them, and faithful to its charge, pleads loudly, pleads unceasingly for man; but its voice, though high, though earnest, can never be raised to the infringement of the Creator's laws, which are based on the everlasting foundation of inexorable justice, inviolate truth; nor can it, in all its anxiety to pluck the brand from the fire that is not quenched, put forth a claim, that would, if granted, weaken one, ay, *one* of the sanctions of God's government, one of the stabilities of God's throne. No! the mercy of which the Scriptures speak is a mercy that will harmonize with the other attributes, and which, while day and night it intercedes for all men, can intercede only so far as to show that God, if he be a merciful God, (and oh! he is,) he is also a *just* God.

While I agree, however, with J. P. S. in these sentiments, I cannot at all reconcile to myself the reasonableness of his critique upon the *word* mercy, as quoted from the instances of the blind man and the publican, 18th chap. of St. Luke's Gospel. He is certainly correct in concluding the two cases to be unlike, although similarly expressed; for the one—that of the blind man, was an appeal for pity to be exercised towards his *body*, that of the publican, for pity to be exercised towards his *soul*. Of course, then, the cases are unlike.

But to the point: J. P. S. says, "the word, though, in the prayer of the publican, was *ἰασθητι*, an expression that contains in it a direct allusion to the כפרת of the Old Testament, the mercy-seat, (see Exodus, 25th chap. 17th and 22d verses,) of which it is written, 'There I will meet with thee.' This word is translated by the Seventy *ἰλασθησιν*; which word was thence transferred into the New Testament, (Hebrews, ix. 5.) To this word, *ἰλασθησιν*, there are frequent allusions in the New Testament scriptures.

St. John, in his First Epistle, says, "*He* is the propitiation (*ἱλασμος*) for our sins." St. Paul, though, in Rom. iii. 25, expressly declares that the Lord Jesus Christ is the *ἱλαστήριον*; that he is set forth the mercy-seat to declare the righteousness of God. From these considerations we learn the nature of the prayer of the publican. It was an appeal to God for pardon through that way which he had appointed for sinners to approach him; and interpreted by the light of the New Testament dispensation was to this effect, "Save me, O God, for Jesus Christ his sake." Now what, pray, are are "these considerations" from which we derive this more than critical conclusion? Is it because St. John in one epistle, and St. Paul in another epistle, call the Saviour the "Propitiation" and the "Mercy-seat," that therefore the publican appealed for pardon through Him? I can see no such *vis consequentia*, nor can I well see how J. P. S., however imaginative and ingenious, could arrive at such an inference. Just as well might he argue that the heathens, when they prayed to their Jupiters, their Junos, their Apollos, Minervas, Venuses, and the whole group of the Pantheon, for mercy, and required them to be *ἱλααι*, or propitious; that, inasmuch as sacred writers had afterwards called our Immanuel the *ἱλασμος*, or *ἱλαστήριον*, it should be believed these said heathens applied for mercy to their said deities through the appointed medium—even Immanuel! just as well. But I mistake, else the term used by the publican is found in several places throughout the Epistles, signifying pity towards the *soul*. Indeed both expressions are *radically* the same; *ἱλααι* being derivable from *ἱλαος*.

Being upon the subject, I may remark that the circumstance of the publican and the Pharisee going up into the temple to pray is recorded rather as an *illustration* than an actual fact. We are told, too, of "a sower going out to sow" in like manner. This not being borne in mind often misleads. It is seldom, very seldom, I take up my pen to employ it in such *nice* points as this. I leave subjects of this sort to younger and fresher minds—minds better able to enter into those *minutiae* with which tyros may more properly employ themselves. But the present was an occasion that induced me to wish once more to be allowed a corner of the EXAMINER. I saw a critique, ingenious, but hypercritical, and, in my poor opinion, not exhibiting much of seasoned old age. J. P. S. I take for granted, is either a candidate for orders, or lately admitted to them. He possesses ingenuity enough to render his productions at any time worthy of attentive perusal. I would advise him (and I am one who, from his *years* at least, should be capable of counselling) to beware of what most young men are apt, almost naturally, to fall into—I mean a desire to invent rather than discover; and to search the Scriptures with an eagerness to ascribe some or other meaning to expressions which was never intended.

I am sure J. P. S. will take what I say in good part, and not be displeased with the *counter critique* of

AN OLD CLERGYMAN.

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,

AND

Church of Ireland Magazine.

No. XXXIX. SUPPLEMENT, 1834. VOL. III.

CROLY ON THE ROMISH CHURCH IN IRELAND.*

(Concluded from page 807.)

We copy the following extract from a pamphlet published in 1746 :

"Popish tenants are daily preferred, and Protestants rejected, either for the sake of swelling a rental, or adding some mean duties which Protestants will not submit to ; but the greatest mischief in this way is done by a class of men whom I will call land-jobbers. Land-jobbers have introduced for farmers the lowest sort of Papists, who were employed formerly as labourers, while the lards were occupied by substantial Protestants : but since potatoes have grown so much in credit, and burning the ground has become so fashionable, (a manure so easily and readily acquired,) these cottagers, who set no value on their labour, scorn to be servants longer, but fancy themselves in the degree of masters, as soon as they can accomplish the planting an acre of potatoes. One of this description not being able singly to occupy any considerable quantity of ground, twelve or twenty of them, and sometimes more, cast their eyes on a ploughland occupied by many industrious Protestants ; who, from a common ancestor, planted

* An Essay, Religious and Political, on Ecclesiastical Finance, as regards the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland ; interspersed with other matters not irrelevant to the subject. By the Rev. David O. Croly, Parish Priest of Ovens and Aglis. Cork : Barry Drew. Dublin : William Curry, Jun. and Co. London : R. Groombridge. 1834.

there, perhaps one hundred years before, have swarmed into many stocks, built houses, made various improvements, and nursed the land, in expectation of being favoured by their landlord in a new lease. These cottagers seeing the flourishing condition of this colony, the warm plight of the houses, but especially the strong sod on the earth, made so by various composts, collected with much toil and care, and which secures to them a long continuance of their beloved destructive manure, made by burning the green sward, engage some neighbour to take this ploughland, and all jointly bind themselves to become under-tenants to the land-jobber, and to pay him an immoderate rent. This encourages him to outbid the unhappy Protestants, and the great advance in the rent tempts the avaricious and ill-judging landlord to accept his proposal. The Protestants being thus driven out of their settlements, transport themselves, their families and effects, to America; there to meet a more hospitable reception amongst strangers to their persons, but friends to their religion and civil principles." *

But were the people and the priests at this period well affected to the government? Let us see. If loyalty were to be measured by profession, nothing could be more assured. During the controversy which was carried on at the commencement of the reign of George the Third, between Doctor Woodward, Protestant bishop of Cloyne, and Doctor Butler, Popish archbishop of Cashel, and in which the celebrated Father O'Leary took a prominent part, the Popish writers took infinite credit to their clergy for their loyalty to the house of Hanover; and they endeavoured, with great pains, to cast suspicion on the veracity of the informations of John Henesy, Popish priest of Doneraile, that were sworn before Lord Doneraile, in the year 1733, and occupied the deep attention of the Irish Parliament, which deposed that a Roman bull was sent from Brussels, in the year 1729, to Christopher Butler, titular archbishop of Cashel, and by him transmitted to the several bishops in Munster, granting a plenary indulgence to all Catholics, provided they complied with the terms of said bull, the principal of which were, to contribute money towards the success of the Pretender, and the dethroning of the intrusive King George. All this was declared to be false swearing on the part of Henesy; and the Popish advocates, in and out of Parliament, up to the time of the Union, made a merit of the loyalty of the Irish towards the house of Hanover, when Scotland, on the contrary, proved itself so hostile to their dynasty. But when there was

* We are indebted to that truly admirable work "*Phelan's Policy of the Church of Rome*," for this quotation, and for many other observations contained in this article.—We think this work was never sufficiently appreciated. Would that its author were now alive, to stand up, in the great power of his mind, to defend the church of which he was the strength and the ornament.

perfect safety in the announcement, out comes the acknowledgment of Bishop Doyle, in his examination before the committee of the House of Commons, in 1825, that the Popish hierarchy were in constant communication with Rome concerning the advancement of the interests of the House of Stuart, and that the Pretender always nominated to the vacant sees.

There is not room for us to enlarge on the influence the Romish clergy exercised in maturing the rebellion of 1798. That they knew of it, it is impossible to doubt; that they were not so prominent as leaders in its commencement as they had been in former rebellions, it is fair to allow. The lessons of history had instructed them that it was more to the purpose to remain in the back ground; but we know from the depositions of Doctor Mc'Nevin and others, that the Irish leaders of that rebellion never entertained sanguine hopes of success, until they were sure of the good will of the Popish priests. But, alas for these leaders, when they had called forth this power into active efficiency, they found it was a Frankenstein, a monster which they could not manage—a thing more than man, that tore the guidance of the population out of their unsteady grasp.

And so the admirers of the Goddess of Reason and Rights of Man saw from the North, the southern lights of Scullabogue, and they despaired of the Irish republic one and indivisible. In Wexford, where the rebellion became general, where the early successes over the King's troops gave the clergy the confidence to act pursuant to their wishes, they headed the rebels; they gave a direction to their insurgency; they put forward, with great effect, the opinion which Hussey, Roman Catholic bishop of Waterford, had given, that the religion of Rome was as favourable to a republic as to a monarchy; they therefore declared that Ireland should be governed under a Catholic and spiritual commonwealth; they announced that it was ordained of God, and had been prophesied that there should be but *one* religion in the land—the holy Catholic—out of whose pale was no salvation. Priests, who declared themselves bullet-proof, marched at the head of their troops, calling on the men to follow them, and fear not, for if they but took up the dust from the road and threw it at the King's troops, they would fall dead before them. Mass was said every day in the insurgent camps, and charms were doled out to the believing soldiery, that were to prevent the balls of the King's muskets from penetrating their sanctified bodies.*

* Copy of a priest's protection, which he sold, and which, hanging about the people's necks, he said would make the bearer proof against the power of heretical artillery:

“ In the name of God, I. N. R. I., I. H. S., and of the Blessed Virgin, amen. No gun, pistol, sword, or any other offensive weapon, can hurt or otherwise injure the person who has this paper in possession; and it is ear-

We are not writing a history ; all our desire is to give, as far as space will allow, a continuous chain of evidence to show how the action and reaction of priest and people have kept up the spirit of insurgency in Ireland.

Before concluding this imperfect sketch, let us allude to an act of the popish hierarchy in Ireland, which appears to us one of the most pregnant instances of deep and gratuitous disaffection to the British government which the whole story of Ireland affords. All who know anything of the history of the French Revolution are aware that the republican government of France had required of the clergy an adhesion to their Jacobite principles, and a consent to the alienation of church property ; this the great bulk of the clergy refused, and in consequence, they underwent, perhaps, as great a persecution as church history has on record. Many were beheaded ; others were drowned by wholesale, and others were deported to pestilent climes ; while those who could escape, fled to foreign lands. In England thousands found an asylum, and were not only sheltered, but received with honour, and hospitable distinction, by the Protestant nobility and gentry. These persecuted men were supported in their exile and deprivations by the applause of the existing Pope, and were treated by him as martyrs in the cause of Catholicity.—But times changed ; the French Revolution passed through its several phases ; Bonaparte came into power, and a Pope arose who was willing to guide the bark of St. Peter, steering, not by principle, but by expediency. Moreover, Bonaparte had a mighty army encamped opposite the shores of England, and thousands believed, and thousands in Ireland hoped, that the time was at hand when a French army, headed by the Great Captain of the age, would possess himself of London, and become master of all Ireland. In this state of affairs the Irish prelates assembled, June 9, 1809, at Tullow, in the county of Carlow, and decreed in Synod, "That Pope Pius the Fifth, by acceding to a concordat with Napoleon, had only yielded to the dreadful exigencies which the times demanded from a true shepherd of the Christian flock."

Doctor O'Connor (and we pray the reader to bear in mind that he was a Roman Catholic) thus observes on this synodical decree :

"Exigency of times—this is the plea alleged for all these acts of our bishops, in the Synod of Tullow—can evil be done that good may follow ? One of these good acts was the crowning of Buonaparte ; another was the dispossessing innocent bishops of their sees, which is a schismatical act ; a

nestly recommended to all women with child to carry it, as it will be found an infallible preventative against the fatality of childbirth.—From "Taylor's History of the Rebellion in Wexford."

third was the implied acknowledgment, that all the French nobility were justly disinherited, and robbed of their properties; a fourth was the implied deposition of the Bourbons, with an implied absolution of their subjects from their allegiance; a fifth was the solemn benediction and sanction given to usurpation, under the horrible plea of exigencies of times! A sixth was the implied recognition of the disinheritance of the Bourbons from their family titles, and from all their property of all sorts and kinds, as well as from the throne of France!!! All this is implied in the acceptance of the pontifical acts, by which Pius VII. has ratified the concordatum with Buonaparte; and yet the Irish bishops have declared their approbation and concurrence; and this they have done *motu proprio*, without being called upon by any legitimate power, to make any declaration, or pass any opinion whatsoever on the subject!"

Here, then, were Irish bishops solemnly assembled in synod, acknowledging as sovereign of France, the man whom the British empire was fighting against as an usurper, and as one who was determined to utterly effect its ruin, and that to the exclusion of the lawful king of France, to the deprivation of the loyal French nobility of their estates, and the loyal French bishops and clergy of their sees and benefices—and all this, forsooth, on a principle of expediency. Well may it be said that this church worships expediency, when it bows to it on such solemn occasions as this—when their great oracle, Doctor Milner, has maintained that even the obligation of an oath was to be measured by expediency.

Thus have we seen that the Romish clergy in Ireland have kept up agitation and disaffection, either by heading the people, as in days of yore, or by pushing them from behind, as in later times. In either case, keeping up their popularity, by fostering in the public mind that large and undefined expectation of getting rid of the Sassenach rule and the Sassenach church; using the power of secret and arbitrary power of excommunication,*

* The power of secret excommunication was conceded by the congregation "DE PROPAGANDA FIDE," to the Irish bishops before the rebellion of 1641. It was a tremendous spiritual munition of war, laid in beforehand, for that great occasion. Doctor Phelan, in the following eloquent terms, animadverts on its subsequent exercise:

"If ever there was a weapon in the hands of men that deserved to be called satanic, it is the papal sword of secret excommunication, which, by one invisible and inevitable stroke cuts off its victims from the charities of present life, and the hope of the life to come. Wielded at such a crisis, and by beings who had little in common with humanity but that gloomy ambition which seems to be less a natural vice than an infusion from the author of the first rebellion. On recording its mysterious terrors we may exercise our conjectures, but they elude calculation. Of this, however, we may be sure, that it assisted powerfully in subduing the timid, in controlling the more resolute, in reducing those conscientious Roman Catholics, who endeavoured to separate religion from the schemes of its minis-

to keep men steadily obedient to their views—but never employing this tremendous engine for any healing or peace-giving purpose. No: not (as Doctor Doyle announced) if rebellion was raging from the Causeway to Cape Clear, would the hierarchy lift their finger, until ALL they wanted was conceded; and ALL they want to have conceded is yet untold; it still keeps widening before us, and seems as comprehensive and as eluding as the horizon.

Such is the brief and confessedly imperfect outline we have deemed it expedient to present, of the power and influence of the Roman Catholic clergy; and that influence which we have attempted to show as being *great* for working evil, but *small* for working good, we hold has been fearfully augmented by the establishment of Maynooth College. Prior to this first essay of establishing Popery in Ireland, the priests educated in foreign seminaries, and more especially those who came from France, were bland and civilized men. Many were the sons of Roman Catholic gentlemen; and they ventured to associate with Protestants, and exhibit a liberality in words and demeanour which tended in some measure to mingle and keep up the charities of life between the professors of both religions. Many, it is true, were, in their hearts, secret infidels; and so that they got their dues, were well supplied with food and liquor at stations, and could ride a good horse, they cared not how the world went.* But not such have proved the first fruits of a popish establishment in Ireland. Christendom has never produced, even in her darkest hour of degradation—no, not in the tenth century—such a band of disciplined bigots and vulgarians as the Royal College of St. Patrick's. Selected for the pliant meanness of their minds, and at the same time clearness of their intellect; chosen from that class immediately above the lowest; brought under a grinding discipline, which nothing but the coarsest ma-

ters, to a silent neutrality, suspicious in the eyes of government, and humiliating in their own; and in driving the awe-struck multitude to propitiate, by any sacrifice, that evil principle from which their better instincts recoiled with abhorrence."

* That infidelity pervaded those universities where the Irish priests were reared, we have the best authority—namely, that of Bishop Doyle, who thus makes the disclosure, and says that, "at the foreign college where he was educated, (we believe Coimbra,) he found himself surrounded by the disciples and admirers of Voltaire; that he frequently, in company with them, traversed the halls of the Inquisition, and discussed, in the area of the Holy Office, those arguments, or sophisms, for the suppression of which this awful tribunal was ostensibly employed, and that at that time, the ardour of youth, THE GENIUS of the place, the spirit of the times, as well as the examples of his companions, prompted him to inquire into all things, and to deliberate whether he should take his station with the infidels, or remain attached to Christianity."—"Letters on the State of Ireland, by J. K. L." 1825, p. 55.

terial could bear, without being worn down to despair, or compressed until the spirit exploded in madness and suicide; withheld with jealous care from all information that could expand the mind or liberalize the feelings; the whole of humanizing literature covered with the blot of an "Index Expurgatorius," with a library kept under lock and key, but to tantalize, with its forbidden fruit; as parish priest, sent forth into the world well made up in dogmatic theology, and extreme self-sufficiency; convinced of papal infallibility, and papal supremacy; possessed of logic enough to be able to keep their adversary on the defensive, and make sophism bear the semblance of sound arguments; such are the men who, as the Father Toms and the Father Pats,* have wielded the fierce energies of the Irish people—have battened on their partialities, by flattering and feeding with fuel the fire of their animosities; have turned them from their landlords, and from their best temporal and eternal interests.†

But in spite of all the well-organized despotism of the hierarchy—in spite of the perpetual blister which the priests, in their self-interested quackery, have kept in appliance on the popular mind

* The following is the observation of one whose authority ought to be high with Roman Catholics, namely, the learned editor of the "Pilot" newspaper, the steady friend and willing martyr of Mr. O'Connell—he, in a tract of his, entitled "Irish Priests," and which he, with his own hand, presented unto us, thus speaks:

"I know of no elevation in life so great and so sudden as that which an Irish priest obtains, compared with his former one, from being the laborious, ill-paid, priest-flogged squalid Irish clown, to that of being the domineering, peasant-flogging, rosy-cheeked Irish priest; from being today an authenticated booby, under the coarse authority of the paternal lash, and tomorrow, before he is even yet bedubbed a priest, during his preparatory course, finding himself the Father Pat, or Tom, or John, of his wondering family, and the oracle of his little cousins. In a word, from being the dupe of priests, the subjugated, demoralized, hoodwinked slave, to that of being himself the awful miraculous thing he before dreaded, the reverend absolver and excommunicator of mankind. Such a transition as this is surely enough to intoxicate an Irish clown."—"Irish Priests," &c. &c., addressed to Right Hon. Charles Grant, M. P., London. Sams. 1822.

† The writer of this article fell into company, some time ago, with a young priest just enlarged from Maynooth, and he certainly was a fair specimen of its general products; shrewd, clever, vulgar, and self-sufficient; deplorably ignorant of every thing that had not a bearing on controversial theology. His mind was as a magazine, stored with all that Jesuitism could cram into it; a bigot and a spiritual slave, in the largest sense of the words. He, with the most solemn countenance, and with a sincerity that there could not be the slightest suspicion of, declared his belief in all the legends of the Breviary; his assurance that the *Santa Casa* was carried by angels from Nazareth to Loretto.—It certainly was a curious study to observe this naturally gifted youth, reduced to such a state by educational discipline as to believe (or act so well the part of a believer) in those absurdities.—It need not to be stated that he was a red-hot democrat, and a repealer.

—there was a power working against them, that justly gave infinite alarm, and which as an antagonist principle, it was their bounden interest to counteract, and that was scriptural education. From the commencement of the present century every religious Englishman and Irishman has justly laid it down as a principle in his own mind, that nothing can effectually tranquilize the Irish but an acquaintance with the religious truths and the pure morality of the word of God; accordingly, societies were embodied, who established schools throughout the kingdom, on the principle that every child who could read should have the Holy Scriptures placed in its hand; and the Bible Society and the Association for Discountenancing Vice, together with other religious bodies, were fellow-workers with the School Institutions in supplying abundantly the Scriptures which the Education Societies required. In this way, upwards of 400,000 children were found reading the word of God; and no doubt, in due time, these means would have had the wished-for effect, had not the Popish clergy, seeing their craft in jeopardy, set themselves steadily to oppose the danger, as it was great; for the people were all alive to the benefits of education, and moreover, they saw that there was a blessed and sublime morality, combined with a simplicity of evangelical truth, which came home to their hearts and understandings, and affected them in a way that the Catechisms, the Christian Doctrine, the treatises on the Scapular, the Heart of Jesus, and the Cord of St. Francis, with which the priests supplied them, never could. Public opinion was thus running with a strong head current against the priests; therefore they put forth all their machinery, and tried one sleight of their usual craft after another; they put forth Pastorini's prophecies; they accredited the jugglery of Hohenlohe's miracles; they published with mighty solemnity the Pope's jubilee; but it would not do. The Bible had given a right direction to the thinking faculties of thousands, and many sighed in secret for deliverance from the meshes of the Mother of Abominations. In this state of things, the clergy saw there was nothing for them but a coalition with the demagogues, and so organize a system of maddening political excitement, which might turn ardent and inquiring minds into a new course of occupation, and which might bring the timid and the peaceful under the yoke of a reign of terror. In this way, a set of demagogues, a set of priests, and a set of confraternity men, have turned Roman Catholicism into a politico-religious crusade. The chapels have been made the arenas of aggregate meetings, rather than temples of the God of peace; the altars have been made to resound with tribunitary harangues, rather than with eucharistical praises of the Lamb of God. And so, on the shoulders of the demagogue has the priest ridden, and on the shoulders of the priest has the demagogue ridden, each mutually the burdened beast and the burdener; and so for a season political popery has her triumph; and the ministry of England, dreading her threatening and resolute front, have bowed in homage before her,

at her loud demand have cashiered Bible education, and have given up the moral and religious education of the population to a corporation, whose past conduct and past success afford but melancholy pledges of what is to be the future moral state of our island.*

It is time for us now to come to Mr. Croly's pamphlet; and with respect to him and it we feel we have more to say than our space allows; but let us do what we can. The man is an able, plain-speaking, clever-writing person; well-instructed in the ways of his countrymen, and one of the best-educated priests that perhaps the south of Ireland can produce. To call him a Roman Catholic would be absurd. After the perusal of his introduction, where he propounds a union of Protestantism with Popery, on novel grounds certainly, as coming from a popish priest, namely, by the Papist giving up almost every important point in which they differ from Protestants. This certainly is a new kind of

* The following is the picture given by a Roman Catholic, of the spiritual tyranny and hatred of Bible education which that body of men evince, unto whom a Whig government has committed, hopelessly—hopelessly, we say, as far as an overruling Providence is not taken into account—the moral culture of the Irish people:

“The clergy of this church (the Roman Catholic) generally oppose the instruction of the people, if connected with the reading of the Scriptures. We have seen the crowded and *shrieking* children turned **FORCIBLY** out of the schools which charity had erected for their instruction; we have seen the little frightened victims rushing from the quiet and happy asylum which had been provided for them, and wandering in despondency upon the roads, where they were condemned, by their ‘Christian Pastors,’ to resume their *old habits of vice and idleness*.”

“If the parents inquire a reason of this strange proceeding, they are told, that the Scripture is a book they must not look into; it would make them Protestants. A higher compliment than this was never paid to the Protestant faith. If they happen not to be sufficiently terrified by the bugbear of Protestantism, and are still inclined to send their children to school, they are told that *punishment* will assuredly follow: *absolution will be refused the offender; the sacrament will be withheld in time of need, and he will be suffered to die without Christian rites*; and the terrified victim of poverty and superstition is subdued!”—Views of Ireland, Moral, Political, and Religious. By John O'Driscoll, Esq. In two volumes. London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, Paternoster-row. 1823.—p. 147.

We acknowledge ourselves indebted for this extract, and for all that is added respecting the county Cavan priests, to a pamphlet, published in the year 1828, by the Rev. Mr. Halpin, of Oldcastle, county Cavan, in defence of certain conversions in that county. The tract is entitled “No Chimera;” it was published by Tims; it is very ably written, and proves most satisfactorily that a vast number of Roman Catholics, in that county, left their church and became Protestant, being, in the first instance, induced to take that fearful, and to them truly hazardous, measure, in consequence of the exaction, the tyranny, the exposed miraculous impostures, and the political agitations of their priests. Mr. Halpin, we believe, with all his talents, piety, and devotedness to the Protestant cause, is (while encumbered with a large family) left as a **PERPETUAL CURATE!!!**

SYNCRETISM, and we give him credit for bravery and nerve when he propounded it; but we neither expect nor wish the union even which he desires. Let but a rag of Popery remain, and we deem that it is enough to weigh down any church. There have been unions of churches, and some to our knowledge have taken place of late years in Germany; but as far as our experience goes, we have found that in the process of such fusions all vitality has evaporated, and the mixed alloy may have been called German silver; but, in our view, it was any thing but a precious metal. But let Mr. Croly's speculations as to a union of Popery with Protestantism fly to the moon, and let us concern ourselves with the picture he has drawn of the Romish clergy in Ireland. Ireland has been long called the Island of Saints, and richer she has been than all the world beside in the growth and perfection of such stock; and if we are to believe the popish, yes, and the radical, orators of the empire, every Romish priest in Ireland deserves to be placed on Colgan's books; and, as beatified, the people are in all religious duty bound to infuse the holy clay in which they are to be buried, and to drink the decent potion off to the good of their souls both now and in purgatory. We, to be sure, as Protestant Christian Examiners, were not so applaudive; and as the odour of their sanctity did not overpower, as with a strong sweet savour, our brain through our nostrils, we became acquainted with certain statements that anticipated every thing that Mr. Croly has exposed. Now, Mr. Crolly has at large expatiated on the mode in which they obtain their incomes, and the avarice, extortion, simony, and sacrilege, that arise therefrom.

"The mode of exacting clerical dues is quite arbitrary and capricious; fixedness and uniformity are out of the question. Almost every thing depends upon the temper and disposition of the clergyman. There are salutary regulations in every diocese respecting church dues, as well as other points of church discipline—put forth by episcopal and synodical authority. Specific sums are laid down as the remuneration to be demanded and paid for the performance of such and such religious rites—for the celebration of marriage, or the oblation of the mass, or the half-yearly administration of the eucharist. These authorised exactions, as may be supposed, are moderate enough, and would not be at all adequate to supply the wants of an aspiring priesthood. Every priest, therefore, looking to his peculiar necessities, or to self-interest, makes the most he can of his ministry, and multiplies his exactions without any reference to statute law or episcopal authority. Owing to this departure from fixed rules, the strangest discrepancy prevails even in the same diocese as to the church demands made upon the people. Some priests, in consequence of their extravagance or their avarice, are much more severe in their exactions than others. They make higher demands for christenings, for weddings, for masses, for confessions, for funerals. It is a fact also that the exactions are continually on the increase; and that the main attention of the clergy appears to be directed towards the enlargement of their incomes. The dues are now nearly double what they were thirty

years ago; so that, strange as it may appear, amid the decay of trade and commerce, agriculture, and manufacture, the revenues of the Irish Catholic Church are in a constant, steady, progressive state of improvement."

"The revenue of the parish priest is derived from a variety of sources. There are confession dues, marriage dues, baptism dues, mass dues, and dues for anointing. He is also paid at times for attendance at funerals. Confession furnishes the most steady and constant source of revenue. Twice a year he collects confession money under the denomination of Christmas and Easter offerings. The mode of making this collection is not very consonant to the spirit of religion. The priest selects one or two houses in every ploughland or neighbourhood, where he holds, according to appointment, what are called "stations of confession;" and it is required that the families all about should meet him when he comes among them upon these occasions; should make their confessions, receive the holy sacrament, and finally pay the customary dues. It sometimes happens that this business is not transacted quietly. If increased dues are demanded—a thing of occasional occurrence—disagreeable and sometimes scandalous altercations ensue. Similar scenes occur when individuals attend and crave time for payment; while such as absent themselves, unless they send the dues as an apology, are generally made the subject of public abuse and exposure. All these things take place in connexion with the celebration of mass and the administration of two sacraments—penance, and the eucharist or the Lord's Supper. The association must be admitted to be rather an unholy one. If no money was to be paid on such occasions, all things would go on well, and the whole scene would be religious and edifying. But the intermixture of money transactions and money altercations changes the entire scene, and proves at once a fatal counteraction to all the previous works of devotion. Most certainly the good of religion requires an alteration in this matter. But supposing all things to go off quietly, and without a murmur, is it right that the payment of money should be coupled with the administration of religious rites? The custom on the face of it bears an unholy complexion. It transforms religious rites into merchantable commodities; which the priest prices and turns to his own advantage in the best manner he can. He gives and he gets *quid pro quo*. This is the appearance of the thing; and the common people do imagine that they pay their money in lieu of getting confession and communion. So deeply, indeed, is this persuasion engraven on their minds, that they consider themselves exempt from the obligation of payment unless they actually get absolution and the holy sacrament—that is, value for their money."

Marriage is in the eye of the Roman Catholic Church a holy sacrament, and solemnity should attend it, and holiness should mark its administration with all its graces. What does Mr. Croly say?

"The administration of this sacrament or rite, generally speaking, takes place under circumstances by no means conformable to the spirit; and all this in consequence of the pecuniary demands made on such occasions. The first

thing done, when there is question of marrying a couple, is to make a bargain about the marriage money. This sometimes causes a considerable delay. The remuneration or stipend prescribed by the diocesan statutes is never thought of for a moment. Indeed all statutes respecting money matters are a mere dead letter. The priest drives as hard a bargain as he can, and strives to make the most of the occasion. Marriages are sometimes broken off in consequence of the supposed exorbitance of the demands. All this is in opposition to the intention of the church and the spirit of religion. It is simony to all intents and purposes—that is, selling a sacrament or spiritual thing for money; and putting on it a worldly value according to the dictates of avarice and caprice, without any reference to fixed rules or regulations. But this is only a preliminary proceeding. Demands of money are made upon such as are present at the marriage—at least upon the male portion of the assembly. This gives rise not unfrequently to a new and unhallowed scene. The transaction may, by chance, pass off quietly; that is, when every one contributes according to the wishes and expectations of the clergyman. But this does not always happen. In general the demands are considered unreasonable, and the priest is disappointed in his expectations. Some endeavour to evade the payment of any contribution; others give but little, and the few that please the priest are mere exceptions to the general rule. What is the consequence? The clergyman, after begging and entreating for some time to little purpose, gets at length into a rage, utters the most bitter invectives against individuals—abuses, perhaps, the whole company, and is abused himself in turn, until at length the whole house becomes one frightful scene of confusion and uproar; and all this takes place at the administration of one of the sacraments of the Catholic church.”*

* We ourselves recollect an anecdote told us by a Tipperary magistrate, illustrative of the above. One morning immediately preceding Lent, our justice was accosted in his official apartment by a neighbouring farmer of some substance and respectability, who, having his head bound up, bore every appearance of being engaged in some bloody affray.

“What’s the matter, Paddy?” says the magistrate. “I suppose you have been engaged in a row at the fair of —, and it’s little I pity you, or any one like you, who meddles in such disgraceful riots.”

“No, in troth, that’s not the truth of it, Master Tom; but the smash my poor head is in all comes from the heavy whip of Father Philip, our priest. Glory be to God, I never saw his like when in a *rale* passion.”

“And what did you do, Paddy, that brought on you such punishment?”

“Och, then, nothing at all at all but this, please your honour: at the wedding of Jim Ryan with Judy Coffy, I went, as needs must, to the marriage, and when the plate went round, our Father Phil. took a new and cute way enough to see what all of us laid down; for, instead of one, he tuck two plates, and as fast as each neighbour put down his share, why he passed it over to the plate in his left hand; so by this *manes* he knew at a turn of his eye what every one put down. And so, when it came to my turn, I dropt on the plate all I was master of at the time, a two-and-sixpenny; at the sight of which, his reverence grew white as milk with rage—run to where behind the door his big heavy horsewhip was a hanging, and up he comes to me, and sputters out, ‘You mane, dirty, scullogue of a negur, I’ll

Mr. Croly exposes the cupidity and exactions of the Romish clergy in their administrations of baptism and extreme unction; and thus he speaks of masses:

"Masses, too, are priced like other rites of religion. A person is said to get a mass, or to have a mass said for him, when special mention is made of him by the celebrating priest, or when he is especially recommended to the Almighty at a particular part of the canon of the mass assigned for recommendations of the kind. This is supposed to produce great spiritual, and perhaps temporal benefit to the person so recommended. This recommendation is also supposed to benefit departed souls—that is—such as are detained in the prison of purgatory; and this is the reason why it is said that the mass is offered for the living and the dead. The efficacy of masses in this respect is one of the most obscure points in scholastic theology, and requires the utmost exertion of ingenuity to be put in a tangible shape. The general notion is, that masses are beneficial in some way—no one being able to define exactly in what this benefit consists. But the general idea of their efficacy in the visible and invisible world augments considerably the revenue of the church. This matter is particularly insisted on at a particular season of the year—the commemoration of All-souls—the second of November. Every effort is then made to interest the faithful in behalf of the souls in purgatory, in order to increase the customary contributions for mortuary masses. Doctrines are frequently advanced on those occasions prompted by cupidity—not very consonant to reason or the Scriptures; and the congregation is led into error in order to replenish the coffers of the priest. The love of filthy lucre has done much mischief of this kind in the church. Is not the present dependent state of the priesthood in question, a stimulus to these extravagancies and abuses? Would an independent, high-minded priesthood descend to such sacrilegious artifices to extract money from the pockets of the ignorant?"

tache you how again you'll put off your clergy with such a trifle; and with that he hot me such a clink in the temple, that I fell like a cock, and the blood spouted out, and there I lay, and all the neighbours thought I was kilt and dead all out."

"Well, Paddy, I suppose you have come to me to take your examinations against Father Philip. County of Tipperary, to wit—Come, Paddy, kiss the book; are you ready to make true answer to what I shall ask you?"

"Och, then, Master Tom, sure you are not serious! Sure you don't think I'm come to swear against my clargy. Me swear so as to hurt a hair of his head! No; I'd sooner he'd cut out my heart, and tear up every vein in my body, than do the likes of that."

"What, then, brought you here to trouble me with your story?"

"Why, then, plase your worship, for no reason at all in life, but to show your worship all my hard case."

"Pat, good morning to you. Mind, when next you go to a wedding, pay your cash more freely, if you would save your bacon."

And the disunion, the jealousies, and the endeavours to overreach each other, which universally prevail :

“ Other bad consequences regarding the clergy themselves arise out of the present system of church support. They are constantly endeavouring to overreach and undermine one another. Every man looks to his own private emolument, regardless of all covenants or agreements, expressed or implied. The curate does not make a fair return to the parish priest, nor the parish priest, perhaps, to the curate ; nor the curates, where a number is associated, to one another. Every man gets in what he can ; and seems to think that he would be justified in appropriating the entire to himself. But this he cannot do ; for he must make some return of his receipts ; and this he does—but an arbitrary return, maimed, docked, curtailed. There is no lack of refined casuistry in this matter. The curate says he labours more than the parish priest, and therefore that he is entitled to more than his allotted proportion of the dues. The parish priest, perhaps, will say that the curate is too well paid, and that he himself should have a larger dividend ; and where there are several curates together, one will say that he is the senior, and that he should not be placed on a level with the others. Sometimes they assign a sweeping reason for this clandestine abstraction of the common revenue—namely, that the dues being in themselves indeterminate and a sort of arbitrary exaction, they are at liberty to make an arbitrary return. The consequence of all this is, that church revenue has become a mere scramble—every man striving to seize upon a larger share and deciding for himself in the appropriation. This is a bad state of things ; it is a shameful state of clerical demoralization, Common honesty is out of the question ; nothing but lies, schemes, duplicity, false returns ; so that the simple and the honest become the prey of the cunning and the crafty. Does not this system of clerical dishonesty strike at the root of public morals ? The morals of the pastor must have an influence on the morals of the flock. Will a priest who has no regard to the sacred rights of property be earnest in exhorting the people to the practice of justice and fair-dealing ? Or will not the contagion of his example stimulate the evil propensities of human nature and spread infection among the whole flock ? Away, then, with a system which leads to all these destructive consequences—a system which degrades religion, and tends directly to demoralize both the pastor and the congregation.”

This, to be sure, is a dark portraiture ; but is it true ? Shall we believe such charges against a church, and against priests on the testimony of *one* ? Yes, if that is corroborated by others. We have already adduced the deposition of Father Morrissey ; we will now produce others. In the county of Cavan, in the year 1817, there was a meeting of the Roman Catholic laity held in the county town, to take into consideration the state of their clergy ; and Doctor M'Donald, whom we personally have known as a most reputable and able physician, addressed the chairman as follows :

“ Mr. Chairman—The object of this meeting is very well known. I know it is with great reluctance the *laity* come forward on this occasion ;

and nothing but a superior and *irresistible* sense of duty could have brought me to meddle at all in ecclesiastical concerns. It is a lamentable fact, that notorious and flagrant abuses have been growing up in this diocese for a considerable time: they are become the theme of universal conversation and animadversion with all ranks of people—clergy, and laity, Protestants and Catholics.

“It is time that the hollow murmuring of general discontent should vent through their proper channel—the public expression of our sentiments. It is not my intention to enumerate all the abuses, or mention the names of unfortunate men, whose *scandalous lives* render them unfit for the ministry of the gospel. Instead of keeping pace with the illumination of the age, and improving in morality and good sense, we have been progressive in a state of rapid and shameful deterioration.

“Ganganelli, one of the greatest luminaries ever the church beheld,” (the *Protestant Pope*, as your lordship knows he was called,) “advised the ministers of the gospel to guard against infidelity on the one side, and superstition on the other. Has that admonition been adhered to in this diocese? On the contrary, a superstition of the most monstrous and detestable description, that would have dishonoured and disgraced the most barbarous ages of the world, has taken firm root, and threatens to incorporate itself with true religion, so as to destroy its purity, respectability, and dignity.

“I have no doubt that miracles have been worked in the *early ages* of the church, even after the days of the Apostles; but then, they were only pretended to by men of the most sanctified lives, and whose moral character was above all suspicion. But at this enlightened period of the world, the thing is quite reversed. The exclusive right of working miracles is laid claim to by men of the most infamous and profligate characters, demoralized wretches, who are not only a dishonor to religion, but a disgrace to human nature. Some of them so far gone in folly as well as depravity, as to disdain the aid of hypocrisy, making religion pander to their avarice and profligacy.

“These are lamentable facts; but lamentable as they are, there are present here, at this moment, some of the most excellent of the clergy, ready to attest, if necessary, the truth of what I assert.” *

* “Many of the Roman Catholic clergy, at this time, had the good sense to see the necessity of a reformation, and the good feeling to join the laity in their endeavours to procure it. A few interested disclaimers of the resolutions of the 28th of October, had been got up, with several *false signatures*: among the rest, one purporting to be from the parishes of Ballynamore, Drumreilly, Templeport, and Kilnowley. The following replications are from the spirited parish priest.—*Dublin Evening Post*, January, 13, 1818:

“*To the Editor of the Dublin Evening Post.*

“SIR—The advertisement which I read in your paper of the 1st instant, is *false*, inasmuch as it declares that the feelings and opinions of my pa-

But this is not all; we have another witness—the Rev. Michael Reilly, parish priest of Kilmore, a man who bore, if Doctor M'Donald is to be believed, the very highest character. He publicly denounced the corruptions of his church; and at a meeting of Roman Catholic clergy, in the chapel of Cavan, 18th October, 1817, he protested against the election of one of the priests of the diocese as coadjutor bishop. For this bold act, he was, according to the received practice of his church, suspended, after, as he says, a mission of 32 years; and he subsequently made his appeal to the public. From it we extract the following:

“Postscript to Letter II.—‘My lord, I am anxious and wishing that this meeting of the clergy should take place as soon as possible, as I presume the object of it shall be to establish a *strict discipline*, and *purge the diocese of its licentiousness and immorality*, which of late has taken deep root in this country. I hope there shall be allowed a *free discussion*; and that every clergyman will be allowed to speak his mind freely, without any dread of suspension; and that any priest convicted of the above crimes shall be duly punished. I know a good deal, and shall speak out.’”

rishioners are in contradiction to the resolutions of the general meeting of lay Catholics of the diocese of Kilmore, held at Cavan, the 28th of October last.

(Signed)

“HUGH REILLY, P. P. of Drumreilly.”

“To the Editor of the *Dublin Evening Post*.”

“SIR—The advertisement which appeared in your print of the 1st instant, signed by a few individuals, and purporting to convey to the public the sentiments of the Roman Catholics of the parishes of Ballynamore, Drumreilly, Templeport, and Kinowley, is *false*, inasmuch as it relates to the Roman Catholics of Ballynamore. They lament with me, that divisions exist among the clergy and the laity. We hope that an amicable *adjustment* will shortly terminate these conflicts of opinion.

“H. REILLY, P. P. of Ballynamore.

“Ballynamore, January 4, 1818.”

“The disclaimers were followed up by sundry counter-statements, and the public disavowals of several signatures that had been forged to them: amongst others, those of Mr. Donovan, Mr. Francis Kernan, Mathias Brady, M.D. &c.—*Vide Evening Post*, passim from January to March, 1808.”

• “‘I know a good deal, and shall speak out.’”

“The reverend writer offered the corroborating testimony of other Roman Catholic clergymen. ‘I called on you,’ says he to the bishop, ‘for a meeting of the clergy; a general one, if you thought proper; but if a particular one, not to forget to summon Father Phil. Reilly, of Bailieborough, Father Phil. M’Gauran, of Swanlinbar, and Father Hugh Reilly of Ballynamore; and I came to learn since, that Mr. Blake of Moybulog, will give great assistance in throwing light on the investigation. By the united evidence of these gentlemen, you will be able to decide—I shall assist myself, and interrogate them.’—*Series of Letters*, &c. p. 14.”

"Letter IV. 'I married a man from the parish of Lavey, about ten years ago, to a young girl in this parish; they, after living together for a year, separated; and have since lived separated. Susy Shepherd, who lived with Father Pat for a long time, has been married (or a marriage attempted) by —— or his curate to this man."

Letter V. 'There are many marriages to be inquired into, besides Susy Shepherd's. God knows, I wish she had not been born, for reasons which I shall not mention. I shall not say any thing of the marriage of Father ——'s niece, of ——, who has been lately married, or a marriage attempted. But as an old priest, I recommend your lordship to look to it, as it turned out to be a case of great scandal in this quarter. But, my lord, I beg your serious attention to a marriage which has lately been attempted by ——, of a parishioner of mine, (whose wife is still living,) and a servant in this neighbourhood. It appears these priests may consider themselves justified in whatever they do, since the marriage of Susy Shepherd has remained unnoticed. Good God! what an age do we live in! Bigamy not only connived at, but openly avowed and supported. If this system be persisted in, I am afraid Mahometanism, with its plurality of wives, will be imperceptibly introduced.

"Good and gracious God! what a rigorous account will very shortly be demanded of those concerned, either directly or indirectly, in the *extraordinary crimes* committed in this diocese! I tremble for the welfare of religion. I tremble for the salvation of the people. I am afraid, if crimes are not immediately checked, and a reform effected, and that *chiefly* among the clergy, that these are only the apparent symptoms of ruined religion in Catholic Ireland!!!"

"Letter VI. 'These, my Lord, are the subjects that ought to engross your attention. Instead of putting a clergyman in nomination for your coadjutor, you should set about the work of reformation, the necessity of which is fully developed in the Laymen's Resolutions at Cavan.' This letter goes on to state that 'the Diocese of Kilmore is the subject of table conversation over a great part of Europe;' and concludes with this eloquent peroration: 'The subject is a sublime one—nothing less than a portion of the church of God committed to your care, which, by a criminal apathy, you have neglected, and suffered enormities, without control, to disfigure, until the laity thought proper, though reluctantly, to interfere, and to announce its state and degradation to the world.'

"The extraordinary account of the death of the titular Bishop, Dillon, we shall not venture to extract. We refer our readers to the pamphlet itself, which, if the priests have not suppressed it, may be still found at Cavan. It does not appear that there was any coroner's inquest held on the body."

Well, these testimonies may not be enough; let us, then, have one more, and from another priest and another diocese; and with it, for the present, we will be satisfied:

“From a letter addressed to his Holiness Pope Leo XII., by the Rev. Patrick Grady, parish priest of Ballymoat, in the diocese of Achonry :

‘*To His Holiness, Pope Leo. XII.*

‘**HOLY FATHER**—As the Prefect of the Propaganda has not replied to my letters, I complain to your Holiness that the Right Rev. Patrick M’Nicholas, Roman Catholic Bishop of Achonry, in Ireland, to make room for his unlearned cousin, has, without assigning any cause, forced me from my chapel and parish, by inducing the lower order, his relatives and connexions, in imitation of his predecessor, to rise in opposition to me. (I have objected to the promotion of each of these prelates.)

‘As senior canon of the diocese, I complain that the bishop has suppressed our chapter—gives no redress of complaints in cases ever so enormous, against his favourites; that the form of worship is much altered by his cousin and others, especially by his V. G., a man who has got but one year’s college education! but had the merit of raising subscriptions to purchase a gig for the bishop! and of procuring suffrages for his promotion. That the bishop now pretends to have a power from the Holy See, to bless Scapulars, (now a profitable business,) and publicly sold indulgences, until the archbishop stopt the practice; tolerated the public sale of mock indulgences, in Ballymoat, the year of the jubilee; tolerates a priest who preaches, ‘that Judas would not have betrayed Christ, had he known him to be the Son of God!! and that every young man and woman of the parish are wallowing in the sin of fornication, and every married person in adultery! so that, like Sodom and Gomorrah, ten just persons are not to be found among them;’ and other extravagancies, a knowledge of which, I think, he could only have from the * * * That he employs, in the sacred ministry, persons uneducated.

‘On behalf of the declining Catholic church of Ireland, I also complain—that so long as the intervals between the periods (sometimes twenty years) of administering confirmation in some dioceses, that at least half the faithful die without the comforts of that sacrament; and since bishops began to exact money on marriages, they have, with the exception, so far as I know, of Dr. Doyle’s diocese, and that of Clogher, abolished the publication of banns—hence the overgrowth of population. Cousins-german are married, concealing the kindred; the marriage of a man to the sister of his deceased wife, and of a female to her god-father, are not unknown, because time is not given to discover impediments; in such intervals matches would be broken off, and then so many crowns would be lost to bishops! What cruelty to unite Christians by an indissoluble tie, without time to discover whether in temper or morals they may or may not be fit for each other! Yet, I am blamed for holding that no valid absolution can be given to a bishop while in that practice.

'The indulgence of the Scapular is for sale in many places, and Scapulars blessed and given by secular priests; and modern priests, in many places, (departing from the practice of their predecessors,) send persons, by way of penance, to perform stations at wells, where the Druids taught, that in them resided a portion of divinity. Catholic prayers are there said, but the duty is finished by paying a religious respect to the water; and these persons sticking bits of their clothes into the crevices of the adjacent walls, and fastening such to the branches of the bushes there, by way of an offering to the supposed tutelary saint of the well! Archbishop Kelly sent persons, last year, to perform stations in the usual way, by way of public penance, at one of these wells, which greatly strengthened the popular error.

* * * * *

'I have the honour to be, with profound respect,

'Your Holiness's most humble servant,

'PATRICK GRADY, P. P.

'Rabit Hall, Ballymoat, October 29, 1827.'

"The entire letter may be found in the *Dublin Evening Mail*, November 14, 1827."

We have, in the beginning of this review, observed that under the voluntary-involuntary system of priestly payments, there was a necessity imposed on the clergy to go with the passions, and to pander to the prejudices of the people. Here is what Mr. Croly says on the subject:

"Let us view the conduct of the Irish priests, this time past, as instructors of their people. Have they attended to the preaching of the Gospel? Have they inculcated the principles of the Catholic religion? Their congregations every where have shown an utter disregard to law and to the constituted authorities; nothing among them but sedition and insubordination, burning and maiming, murder and massacre—mob-law, in short, the greatest of all curses, the order of the day. What did the priests—the guides and pastors of the people—do under these circumstances? Did they set their faces against this unhappy state of things? Did they preach obedience and subordination? Did they inculcate submission to the authority of law; or aid in preserving the peace and tranquillity of society?—all which they were bound to do as ministers of the Gospel and priests of the Roman Catholic church. This is a position that cannot be disputed. It has been always the boast of the Roman Catholic church that she teaches her children to observe the laws, to respect the civil magistrate, and to do nothing inconsistent with the public peace and with individual security. The Irish Catholic priests have not this time past preached these doctrines to the people. It would be too much, perhaps, to say that the priests themselves were the original instigators of the misguided multitude. There is no doubt that many of them acted a prominent part in the business; and the impression on the minds of the common people was, and is, that the priests gave it

their full and unqualified sanction. But many of them yielded reluctantly to the torrent, and appeared to give their approbation to that which they in reality condemned. They went with the multitude, instead of guiding the multitude; and suffered religion and morality to be completely turned topsy turvy. What was the cause of all this? Many causes, no doubt, may be assigned. National and religious prejudices might have had a share, sectarian hatred, cowardice, a general perversity of morals. But can it be said that the present state of clerical dependance for support upon a capricious multitude had no share in determining this unbecoming conduct on the part of the Irish Catholic priesthood? The multitude held the strings of the clerical purse; and wo betide the unfortunate priest who would set himself in opposition to their wishes. As a body they became all-powerful in this respect. The common cry among them was, that they would not uphold any priest who would not back them in their proceedings; and instances could be produced where this threat was carried into execution; and upright individuals of the clerical body were made the objects of every species of injustice and persecution. The dread of poverty and of being cast off by those to whom they looked for subsistence contributed powerfully to make the body at large become mere time-servers, and overlook the obligations of their sacred ministry. It was a kind of general apostacy arising from base considerations of self-interest. Accordingly they either preached or countenanced lawless combination, and suffered the temple to be profaned.

“Dicite pontifices quid in sancto facit aurum.”

And what has been the effect of the teachings and preachings, of the influence, ordinary and extraordinary, of this fine priesthood on this fine peasantry. Here is a priest's picture of the moral and religious state to which Irishmen are brought, when given up to a body of men who have excluded the blessed word of God:

“It is a prevailing notion in this country that priests possess the most extraordinary powers imaginable; that the visible and invisible world is under their control; that they can at their will and pleasure make sick or make well; give prosperity or adversity, damnation or salvation; and yet this extreme credulity of the vulgar does not prevent them—so much are they under the control of their passions—from setting themselves occasionally in opposition to these same all-powerful personages, and braving the fatal consequences of their destructive wrath. They hold the strangest opinions regarding departed souls. They fancy the huntsman, the jockey, the sporting squire, will be riding their favourite horses in the other world; and they are persuaded that, when any particular mishap befalls themselves, it is done through the malicious intervention of some deceitful persons, their enemies. They, in general, set more value on trivial observances than on the weighty points of the law. They are extremely addicted to lying, to fraud and circumvention. Nothing can persuade them but that they ought to hate and exterminate, if in their power, all such as differ from them in religion.

- *Inde furor vulgo quod numina vicinorum*
Odit uterque locus, quum solos credit habendos
Esse Deos quos ipse colat. JUV. SAT. 15.

It gives them great offence to see their priest on friendly terms with Protestants; and such priests as stand in this sort of relationship are, by way of reproach, denominated Protestant priests. They believe in ghosts, fairies, hobgoblins; give credit to dreams and fortune-tellers; practise superstitious observances without number—spells, charms and incantations."

There is no one acquainted with the interior of Ireland that will not recognize the picture as true to life. All must have heard of holy priests whose doings were miraculous, but whose sanctity was any thing but dry, they being the most drunken beasts in the whole district; they must have heard of holy wells, of holy bones, and holy stones. Doctor O'Connor, a priest, acknowledges (Letters of Columbanus) that these are pagan practices :

"I asked," says he, "a very old man, Owen Nestor, what advantage he expected from frequenting wells contiguous to an old blasted oak, to an upright unhewn stone, and what was the meaning of the yet more singular custom of sticking rags in the branches of such trees? His answer, and the answer of the oldest man, was, that their ancestors always did it, that it was a preservation against *GRASA DRAOIDECHT*, i. e. the sorceries of the Druids, that their cattle were preserved by it from infectious disorders, and that the *DAOINI MAITHE*, i. e. the fairies, were kept in good humour by it."

Doctor O'Connor accuses the popish hierarchy with giving encouragement to this well-worshipping.

But we must come to a close. Our readers who may not have had an opportunity of seeing the pamphlet of Mr Croly, may think that his only object is to expose the present state of popery and the priesthood. No,—this is a means to an end. His purpose is to show that the enormous evils he has pointed out arise from the financial system to which the priests are subject—they are debased, and they have debased the people, according to him, because they have been made dependent on the people for their livelihood. He thence comes to the conclusion that there will be no true religion, no morality, no peace, no prosperity, until the Roman Catholic religion is established, and revenues are allocated for the payment of priests. We are aware that a great many Protestants agree with Mr. Croly. We believe that our existing administration will, if it lasts, immediately originate such a measure; and, if principle is to be sacrificed to expediency, many will say that they are politically wise in so doing: for our-

-
- * The furious crowd would hurry to the d—l
 All such as do not at their altars kneel;
 They fancy to themselves all grace is given,
 And make complete monopoly of heav'n.

selves, we utterly protest against such a measure. We assert that it will not, and cannot, have the desired success of tranquillizing the country; and the result will be, that a large sum will be wasted in fattening a herd of lazy drones; and that no law that a free state can invent will hinder a set of irresponsible friars from coming in; and as the locust eateth up what the canker-worm had left, so they will cut, and eat, and sting, on the strength of the voluntary system, even more than the secular priest: we never can consent to the payment of priests as long as they are popish. No, rather let there be a strong and effectual government to put down demagogues and agitators. Let Bible education be free and unrestricted to all, and this will do more good to Ireland than making drones of parish priests. Mr. Croly confesses that priests have fallen greatly in the people's opinion; this is the truth, and the priests know it; the schoolmaster is abroad, and a powerful monster this pedagogue is, who has been permitted to lecture from the Romish altars; has inculcated lessons that, when well conned over, will make men wise, in a way fatal to that church whose existence depends on a blind submissiveness of the will, and on an unquestioning assent to long-established claims and canons. Already have those possessed with foresight taken alarm; they shudder at the gross error into which their deep hatred to England and to Protestantism has made them plunge; already they find that the "fierce democracy," whose terrible spirit they have evoked, is too powerful for their magic. The foul fiend has come at their bidding, but, when they want to lay him again in the Red Sea, will he sink to his rest? No. He is still before them: he is seen infusing surmises against priestcraft into the minds of the people; and already LIBERALITY calls upon its brother LATITUDINARIANISM, to get rid of priests and their dues, as well as of parsons and their tithes. Therefore, the Romish hierarchy are *now* beginning to think with Protestant parsons, that it was an evil day when the mass-house was made a political arena; and so, all too late, the bishops have fallen back on a canon of the Council of Trent. It won't do. The sceptical schoolmaster is abroad. Mr. Croly is right when he says, that with the rising generation there is little fear of God or man; and the priests ARE LOSING THEIR INFLUENCE. So they are wise in their generation in longing for an establishment to retire upon. We make no doubt that many a bishop and priest secretly longs for the consummation that Mr. Croly so devoutly wishes, and while they hate the man they may love his measure. But is that a reason why Protestants should help, in any way, to bring about the propping a system, that is already tottering with the stroke that its own friends have inflicted on it? No: let Popery die as she deserves, in Ireland as well as in France, by the hands of Infidelity.

In the meantime, let Protestants watch the signs of the times, and act soberly and with prayer. Let Protestant ministers of

all sorts, under the influence of a missionary spirit, take all possible opportunities of placing before the people God's word, and its heart-changing truths, and perhaps the time may come, and that sooner than we expect, when the Lord will raise up statesmen, having the will and the power to snatch the education of the people from the hands of those who have allowed murder and perjury to become light and trivial in a people's eyes, and right and wrong to become so confounded, that the man who would shudder at eating a morsel of meat on a forbidden day, will not hesitate, on any day, for the hire of a few shillings, to imbrue his hands in the blood of a fellow-creature. Let Mr. Croly say what he will, Protestants, on principle, can never consent to give a legal and national establishment to Romish priests.

We trust that nothing said in this Review will be construed as applying personally to any individual clergyman of the Roman Catholic church in Ireland. As a body of men we desire to speak of them, who are constrained, in spite, we hope, of their better natures, to work a system as degrading to themselves as ruinous to their country. As individuals, and as Irishmen, we know that a large number of the Romish clergy are possessed of many estimable and amiable qualities, kind, generous, hospitable, and charitable. It has been our own lot to meet some whose natural talent, good humour, good sense and "*bonhomie*," were calculated to win on our regards, and make us wish that such estimable men were not yoked to a system so narrowing to the mind, so slavish to the intellect, so injurious to society. We therefore desire to be understood that it is against the priesthood, and not against individual priests, that we have directed our animadversions.

EXPOSITION OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.*

THERE is no class of publications which so imperatively presses itself upon the notice of the "CHRISTIAN EXAMINER," as that of publications by clergymen of the Established Church, upon subjects vitally connected with the Church of Christ. We should be wanting in our duty to our readers, and to the church, if we did not impartially and fairly consider all such, where the talent, the good or the evil displayed, make them worthy of attention. We cannot, therefore, pass by "An Exposition of ch. 12, 13, 14, of 1 Cor. With Observations on the Present State of the Church. By the Author of Explanatory and Practical Comments on the New Testament." The character of the author will naturally draw attention to his little work; the talent it exhibits is such as to have an influence upon its readers; and the genuine and sincere piety manifested throughout, is such as would make every Christian wish, if possible, to agree with its author. All these put together make it the more our duty to examine the work, to bring it to the law and to the testimony, whilst we desire to be enabled to do it with candour and firmness. The subject of the work is one of peculiar interest at the present time, one that has been much canvassed; namely, the right the church has to expect the existence of miraculous powers in her believing members at all times. Our author has, we are sorry to say, taken the affirmative side of the question, and maintains that it was the purpose and promise of God that the church of Christ should have been ever guided by the visible manifestation of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost; that it is owing to the want of faith in the church that those miraculous gifts have ceased, and that all the evils to be deplored in her, are to be attributed to their absence, and can only be remedied by their being restored. To defend this position our author uses the following argument:—That God promised the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, or, as he would term it, "the Spirit in power" to the church universally;—that in the early times of the church, every church, and every individual member of the church, possessed, in some degree or other, "*the Spirit in power*;"—and that the consequence was, that through the influence of this manifestation of the Spirit the early church had an unity, a spirituality, a knowledge, a holiness, which he speaks of as almost perfect, which ought to be the state of the church now, and which would be so, but that the church has lost the miraculous powers of the Spirit.

* An Exposition of Chapters xii. xiii. and xiv. of 1 Corinthians. With Observations on the Present State of the Church. By the Author of Explanatory and Practical Comments on the New Testament. Dublin: William Curry, Jun., and Co. London: Simpkin and Marshall, and James Nisbet. 1834.

Now, we are at issue with the much-respected and valued author as to these facts, upon which his whole system is based. We would deny, as far as we understand the Scriptures, that God promised the miraculous gifts of the Spirit universally; that is, to every church, and every individual of the church, during every age of the church. We deny it to be the fact, that in the early times of the church, of which we have an account in the Scriptures, there is any evidence that every church, and every individual member of the church possessed, in some degree of manifestation or other, the miraculous powers of the Spirit. And we further deny it to be the fact, that the churches described in the Scripture did exhibit that perfection of unity, knowledge, spirituality, and holiness, which our author ascribes to them, and attributes to the existence of the miraculous powers of the Spirit amongst them, and which he conceives would be the effect in the present day of the revival of miraculous powers. We shall proceed to consider the arguments used by our author to prove his several positions, and in considering them we shall have opportunity of pointing out why we differ from him.

After a preface which details the reasons for the publication of this tract—namely, the author's wish to convey his change of sentiment as to the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters of 1 Cor., since he wrote his Commentary on the New Testament—he begins with considering the promises made by the Lord of the gift of the Holy Ghost. We shall give his own words:—

“ Before we proceed to an exposition of the chapters under consideration, it may be useful to examine Scripture upon the promises which were made by our Lord, of the gift of the Holy Ghost;—the extent of the enjoyment of that gift, by the early church;—and the object of it.

“ FIRST—As to the promises of our Lord. In St. Mark's Gospel we read, that Jesus said to the eleven Apostles, ‘ Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned. *And these signs shall follow them that believe*: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and, if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands upon the sick, and they shall recover.’ Were none to believe the Gospel, after the days of the Apostles? Yes, in all ages, and in all places—‘ in all the world.’ Therefore, in all ages, might the signs be expected to follow, when the faith in the promise was exercised. (Mark xvi. 15, &c.)”

This is the first and we suppose the strongest text our author has to bring forward, but as it stands in the Scripture it does not answer his purpose. The promise, whatever may be the meaning of it, is made to believers in the gospel. It is evident it cannot mean that in every church in every age every believer shall cast out devils, speak with new tongues, &c. &c. This has not been performed to all believers in every age; therefore this

cannot be the meaning of the promise : therefore in this very first text he is obliged to alter the terms of the promise, and say, "Signs may be expected to follow when faith in the promise was exercised;" he changes the terms from a promise to all believers of the gospel, to a promise to such of the family of God as should believe in this especial promise. As this is a very important feature in the question at issue, we shall stop to notice the way in which our author gets over the difficulty, of God having given an universal promise extending to every individual and every age of the church, and the fact of the whole church for many ages being without the enjoyment of this supposed promise. We shall give it in his own words:—

"We may here notice an important distinction to be observed between a *promisc* and a *prophecy*. A promise may be made void, so far as we are concerned, by unbelief;—a prophecy must, of necessity, come to pass, whether it is believed or not. Our Lord's words in Mark xvi. contain a promise dependant on faith; and from want of faith, and that alone, does it appear that this promise has been made void. To enjoy a promise, faith must be exercised on that promise. If ten promises be given us, and that we exercise faith but on one of them, the other nine will be useless to us. The gifts of the Holy Ghost have been lost to the church, because the promise which secures them has been overlooked by the church, and faith has not been exercised."

There are some respects in which all this is true, but we maintain that it is inapplicable to the case before us. A promise made to man generally is indeed contingent on his faith; he loses the promise by unbelief. But a promise to a believer is unconditional; it is not left contingent upon his faith; it pre-supposes his faith; it is made to him as united by faith to Christ Jesus, in whom all the promises are yea and amen. If we may speak of conditions, he has fulfilled the only condition by coming to Christ and believing in him. Were it otherwise with the Christian church or with individuals, they would be under a covenant of works, and not under a covenant of grace. They would have promises made to them on terms by which they would be sure to forfeit them, just like the promises under the law, which ran, "Do this and thou shalt live." Did the promises of the gospel run thus, *understand rightly and believe all the promises, and then you shall have the enjoyment of the promises*, the church would be as sure to forfeit them, as the Israelites was to forfeit Canaan, which was assigned to them upon the condition of their obedience. So, if the church's possession of the promised Spirit is made to depend on the church's faith, instead of the church's faith being made to depend upon the Spirit, the church will be sure to be without both the faith and the Spirit.

We say, then, that the promise was not made to sinners on the condition of their believing, but the promise of signs following was made to believers. We say that, in our humble judg-

ment, it did not mean that every individual of every church in every age should cast out devils, should speak with new tongues, &c., for all were *not* workers of miracles, all had *not* the gifts of healing, all did *not* speak with tongues, (vide 1 Cor. xii. 29, 30;) but it did mean that the Lord would bear testimony to the truth of the gospel and to the divine mission of its preachers, by signs in attestation of it, in such a degree, as to the number of persons that should perform signs, and in such a measure, as to the time when they should perform them, as in his wisdom should seem sufficient for his purpose, "dividing to every man severally as he will." In this view of the promise, *it was fulfilled as to persons*, when a sufficient number, though not all, performed these signs; *it was fulfilled as to time*, when they were performed at the establishment of Christianity, though not at a subsequent period.

We need not go through all the texts which our author quotes, as many of them bear nothing upon the question between him and us, which is not, whether the Lord promised the Holy Ghost, but whether he promised the Holy Ghost to all as conveying a visible manifestation of miraculous power. We would pass on to those texts which speak of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, an expression which our author endeavours to confine in its meaning to the conveying a miraculous power. For this restriction we conceive that our author has *no warrant* but his own system. When our Lord (Acts i. 4, 5,) promised to his disciples that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence, the promise included, it is true, the miraculous powers conveyed by the sending down on them the Holy Ghost, but was by no means confined to them. In the baptism of the Holy Ghost was included the internal, powerful, enlightening, sanctifying influences of the Spirit, his invisible divine operations, as well as his external visible manifestations; and this we would deduce from the place where the baptism of the Holy Ghost is first spoken of, (Mat. iii. 11,) where John the Baptist says, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." As no man was a disciple of John but he whom John baptized with water, so no man was a disciple of Jesus but he whom Jesus baptized with the Holy Ghost. We join with our author in maintaining that the promise of the baptism of the Holy Ghost was not to the apostles alone, but to all that should receive Jesus. John spoke of it as the very essence and characteristic of the Christian scheme; just as Paul says, Rom. viii. 9, "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the spirit of God dwell in you. Now, if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Whence we come to this conclusion, that, as a man might do miraculous works without being a disciple of Jesus, and as a man might be a disciple of Jesus without doing miracles—as those confessed by

our author to have been disciples of Jesus have for ages been without the power of working miracles—it is not an essential part of the baptism of the Holy Ghost to be endued with the power of working miracles. So far from the term, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, being confined, as our author would confine it, to the imparting such a power, it means a more universal and internal operation, which does not necessarily even include the imparting this miraculous power.

Every Christian, in order to be a Christian, must be baptized by Jesus with the Holy Ghost; but every Christian, in order to his being a Christian, must not necessarily be endued with the power of miracles. Therefore, the baptism with the Holy Ghost is not identified with the being endued with miraculous power. We have shown, then, we think, that the promise that signs should follow them that believe, did not convey a promise that every individual in every church, in every age, should be endued with miraculous powers. We have shown, we think, likewise, that the promise of being baptized with the Holy Ghost, was not a promise of being endued with miraculous powers.

We now proceed to consider the second of the facts relied upon by our author, i. e. that in the early times of the church, every church, and every individual member of the church, possessed, in some degree or other, the miraculous gifts of the Spirit:—

“Let us again turn to the first chapter of the Acts. We there read (v. 13, &c.) that after the apostles had witnessed the ascension of our Lord, they went up into an upper room, where they abode; and that they continued with one accord, in prayer, and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren. After this, they proceeded to elect a successor to the apostate Judas; and the election by lot took place, if not among all the brethren, men and women, who continued together in prayer, and supplication, yet certainly in their presence. ‘In those days, Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said (*the number of the names together were about an hundred and twenty*), men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled concerning Judas,’ &c. ‘And they gave forth their lots, and the lot fell upon Matthias.’ ‘And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, (they who ‘continued with one accord in prayer, and supplication,’ the hundred and twenty, men and women,) were all, with one accord, in one place; and suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they (the hundred and twenty) were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them; and they (the hundred and twenty) were ALL filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.” (Acts ii. 1—4.) Here was the first fulfilment of the promise, made in St. Mark’s Gospel, that the *sign* of speaking with new tongues, should follow, among those who believed in Jesus. Here was the fulfilment of the promise of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, for which the Apostles, ‘and they that

were with them,' (Luke xxiv. 33, 49,) were directed to wait at Jerusalem; and that, not confined to the eleven apostles, but bestowed upon the whole company of believers, men and women, with whom they were associated."

Acts ii. 4, proves that the disciples were all filled with the Holy Ghost, but by no means that they all spake with tongues: they spake with tongues "*as the Spirit gave them to speak.*" According to what we read, 1 Cor. xii. 11, "The Spirit dividing to every man severally as he will." It is not said that the Spirit gave them all utterance (though we freely admit that nothing is said to the contrary); but as it was not the common way in those churches where there were gifts, to make all speak with tongues, to make all to be one member, instead of being many different members, we think it is more probable, in the absence of direct testimony, that the Spirit, which filled them all, did not give to them all to speak with tongues. But as we do not by any means assert that none but the apostles had the gift of tongues or other miraculous powers, we freely concede to all who think that this text implies that all spake with tongues, their full right to think so; but much more is necessary to prove that all in the church in these early days were so gifted. Our author would infer, that the three thousand spoken of as converted in the sequel of this 2d chapter, were all made partakers of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. "In consequence of Peter's sermon, three thousand persons were baptized; and Peter having promised that, if baptized, they should receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost, we may fairly conclude that ALL received that gift." Yes, all received the gift of the Holy Ghost; but as we have seen that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is not to be identified with the gift of miraculous powers, it does not follow that, by receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost, they received the gift of miraculous powers. It no more proves that these three thousand had the gift of miraculous powers, than it proves, contrary to fact, that all now called by the Lord have those gifts. All now called by the Lord receive the Holy Ghost; but, as our respected author admits and grieves, they have not the gift of tongues, nor any other manifestation of miraculous powers; and yet they have the same promise as those three thousand:—"The promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." And we would remark, that here there is nothing that can be construed into contingency in the promise, as God's calling is of his own sovereign grace, and not contingent upon faith or anything else in man: so the gift that God has promised to as many as he shall call, is, in like manner, not contingent upon faith or anything else in man; and if it is the fact that, to those whom God hath called for the last fifteen centuries, he has not given the gift of miraculous powers, it is evident that these gifts of miraculous powers did not form a part of his promise, and therefore are not a necessary part of the

gifts of the Spirit. Our truly estimable author is so prepossessed in favour of the system which he has adopted, that we are sure he is totally unconscious of the want of sound argument for the position which he advocates. But a little further in his tract, our author is hurried on to assert, not as he had done before, that every believer was baptized with the Holy Ghost, and had some manifestation or other of the miraculous power of the Spirit, but he unguardedly asserts that every believer had the gift of tongues :—

“The THIRD question proposed was the OBJECT of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The opinion very generally prevails, that it was in order to qualify the Apostles to preach in languages, which they had not learned by common course of study ; that they might speak, at once, to foreigners ; and that, thus, the spread of the Gospel might be facilitated. In other words, that it was a gift for teaching. If so, this object must have been answered in *all* who received it. But *every* believer received it—three thousand one hundred and twenty, on the day of Pentecost—men and women, who could not all have been teachers ; therefore, the gift was not conferred for the object of spreading the Gospel by teaching.”

Here, if we understand him, he asserts that every believer received from the Holy Ghost the gift of tongues ; for a confutation of which we would only refer him to 1 Cor. xii., especially ver. 30.

We think we need not spend our time in replying to what our author says, as an argument for the church's present possession of the gifts, that they are more required now than they were at the beginning. We would only reply to this, that we submit to the wisdom of our God, who knows far better than we do, what his church requires : we repose upon his unerring wisdom, and his unchanging love. We would say, with Paul, “he that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not, with him, freely give us all things ?” We come to this conclusion : because the God of power and love does not now give to his believing people miraculous gifts, we feel assured, in opposition to our author, that the church does *not* require them now.

In a subsequent part of his pamphlet, our author, from Eph. iii. 4, &c. goes more at length into an attempt to prove that all the churches were endued with miraculous powers ; but, from the very strange things which he brings forward as proofs, we consider that he has most entirely failed. He further takes texts out of all the epistles, as evidences that each of the churches addressed possessed miraculous powers ; and he sees his own favorite doctrine in some, in which, we verily believe, no human being ever saw it before ; such, for example, as Gal. v. “Walking in the Spirit”—“Being led by the Spirit”—“Living in the Spirit”—“Fruit of the Spirit.” He does this whilst in the very place the inspired Apostle states what he conceives to be the fruit of the Spirit, and never mentions one miraculous power.

But the most strange thing, by way of argument, is that by which he attempts to prove that the seven churches of Asia were possessed of miraculous powers. We give his own words; for, were we to attempt to describe his arguments in our words, we are sure that no person would believe that we had not mistaken and misrepresented him :—

“ With regard to ‘ the seven churches of Asia,’ the Epistles to which are contained in the 2d and 3d chapters of Revelation, we may make these observations. They are represented as being *all* similarly constituted. Their ‘ Angels,’ or presiding ministers, are said to have been under the immediate care of Christ, who held them in his right hand ; (chap. i. 20,) and who also had ‘ the seven Spirits’ for the churches, (chap. iii. 1.) In the midst of the seven churches, Christ is represented to have walked. (chap. i. 20. ii. 1.) So that the condition of all being the same, what was true of one, was true of all. We take the first, then, as a sample of all. The church of Ephesus, whose Angel is considered to have been Timothy, (1 Tim. i. 3, 4,) a gifted officer, and apostle, was endowed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost, as has already been shown from the Acts ; (chap. xix. 1—7,) and from St. Paul’s Epistle to that church. We may also take the last of these seven Epistles, addressed to the church of Laodicea, which is mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Colossians ; in which he directs that there should be an exchange of Epistles between those two churches, (Col. iv. 16,) from which we infer that they were of similar constitution ; and that as the church of Colossè had the power of the Spirit, so had also the church of Laodicea. Thus, then, it appears that the first, and last mentioned of the seven churches of Asia, possessed the power of the Spirit—the baptism of the Holy Ghost ; and as all were alike, that the other five possessed that power also.”

If this deserves the name of an argument, we know not what an argument is. It demonstrates the total want of solid foundation for our valued author’s opinions.

We think, then, we have said enough on our author’s second position, that, in the early times of the church, every church, and every individual member of the church, possessed, in some degree or other, “ the Spirit in power.” We think we have shown that he has totally failed in proving this position.

We come now to his third position, that the early church had an unity, a spirituality, a knowledge, a holiness, almost perfect, which ought to be the state of the church now, and which would be so, but that the church has lost the miraculous powers of the Spirit.

In order to maintain this position, our author quotes many of the beautiful traits of Christian unity, sympathy, and love, which we meet with in various parts of the New Testament, particularly Acts iv. 32, Phil. ii. 2, Eph. iv. 3 ; and, having given a very glowing and interesting sketch of the love manifested between Paul and Epaphroditus, as set forth at the end of Phil. 2, he adds :—

"We maintain, that nothing short of the baptism of the Holy Ghost did then produce, or could now produce, such unity, love, and *sympathy* as this passage incidentally displays. And this was nothing uncommon;—it was what was usually felt, and exhibited, by the Christian church, *as it was*, when love, shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost, produced unity and sympathy in the Christian body."

Now, we entirely agree with our author, that "nothing short of the baptism of the Holy Ghost" did, or could, produce such effects; but then we mean a different thing by the baptism of the Holy Ghost: we mean his powerful sanctifying internal influence poured upon believers—he means the endowing them with miraculous powers. We maintain, that the possession of miraculous powers did not produce, nor tend to produce such effects; that there were miraculous powers in churches where no such effects were produced; and further, that where such effects were produced, they were caused by the internal sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost—those saving influences of the Holy Ghost which believers now enjoy, and not by the outward miraculous manifestations, which believers of the present day do not possess. The lovely picture of the church here sketched is not the true portrait of the church *as it was*, no more than it would be the true portrait of the church *as it is*. It is a partial representation. We should recommend our author to consider the case of the Corinthian church, which Paul tells us, "came behind in no gift, was enriched in all utterance, and in all knowledge;" and yet no church was lower in Christian attainment—none exhibited less unity, or less love—they were "*carnal, babes in Christ*;" and this want of unity and love was only equalled by their want of holiness. They had fornication among them, such as was not so much as named among the Gentiles; and they were puffed up when they should have rather mourned, 1 Cor. v. 1, &c. The Corinthian church contradicts the fact, which our author wishes to establish, namely, the purity of the early Christian church; and also the argument he would draw as to the necessary connection between possession of gifts, and high spiritual attainments.

But let us look to the seven churches of Asia. Our author, as we have seen, in support of his system, has done all he could to prove them all to have been in possession of miraculous gifts, with what success the reader of his extraordinary argument will judge. But suppose he had succeeded in proving the fact, how would it have helped him in proving what it is his object to prove, the connexion between the possession of miraculous powers, and the exhibition of exalted spirituality, unity, and holiness. The church of Ephesus is accused by her Lord with having left his first love, and she is threatened with having her candlestick removed out of his place. The church of Pergamos had within her them that held the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of

Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication. She is commanded to "*repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against thee with the sword of my might.*" To the church of Thessalonica the Lord says, "*I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezabel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce my servants, to commit fornication, and to eat things offered to idols.*" Of Sardis it is said, as may be said of our most corrupt churches as they are now, "*Thou hast a few names, even in Sardis, which have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy.*" To the church of Laodicea it is said, "*I know thy works, that thou art neither hot nor cold: I would thou wert hot or cold; so then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.*"

With regard to these corrupt early churches, our author is in this dilemma—either they were possessed of miraculous powers, or they were not. If they were not, then he must abandon his position, that all the early churches, and every individual composing them, were, in their several degrees, possessed of miraculous powers. But, if they were possessed of them, then he must give up his assertion as to the state of unity and holiness derived to the early churches, from the possession of miraculous powers: he must give up his assertion, that the low state of the Christian churches at present is in consequence of the absence of those powers, since there was an equally low state where he asserts their presence; and he must admit his error in supposing that the restoring of those miraculous powers to the church would carry with it an increase in spirituality and holiness, since, according to him, these churches enjoyed those powers, and yet were, notwithstanding, "*wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.*"

We would affectionately warn our author, of whom we can truly say, that "we esteem him highly in love for his work sake," against partial views and statements of scriptural truth, into which a good man and an intelligent man is often drawn, by prejudices and prepossessions, as to some favoured or rejected system. There is not one word that is not true in all our author has said of the excellency of the early Christian church; but then the statement, as a whole, is devoid of truth, because he leaves out all the evil belonging to it, at the very same time recorded of it by the very same authority. And in like manner, we desire not to deny the truth of what he says of the evil of the present church; but yet we say, his statement, as a whole, is not true, because he shuts his eye and closes his mouth as to the few in the present day, who "have borne and have had patience, and for Christ's name sake have laboured, and have not fainted." It did not suit his system to see and to declare either the evil of the early church, or the good, limited though it may be, of the present.

He has therefore closed his eyes so as not to see, and his mouth so as not to declare, a part of the truth with regard to both.

After the introduction, which has drawn from us the foregoing remarks, our author proceeds to give his exposition of the 12th, 13th, and 14th chapters of 1 Cor.

We shall not follow him through his comment, but shall, for the information of our readers, point out some of the leading views connected with his system, which he endeavours to support. For this purpose, we shall give an extract from his remarks upon verses 8, 9, 10, 11 :—

“ We have here an enumeration of the different gifts and powers, one or the other of which was bestowed on ‘ each person ’ in the church, by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The ‘ wisdom,’ and ‘ knowledge,’ and ‘ faith,’ here spoken of, were not such as we now possess ; for we, confessedly, have not the baptism of the Holy Ghost. But these were powers, vastly superior to what we are acquainted with, being among the ‘ gifts’—the preternatural endowments of the Holy Ghost. They were of the same class with ‘ gifts of healing’—‘ working of miracles’—‘ discerning of spirits’—‘ divers kinds of tongues’—‘ interpretation of tongues.’ They were among the ‘ manifestations ’ of the Spirit, given to each person. All these gifts were distributed among the members of the churches, as God willed. One person might have more than one gift, as we shall find in chap. xiv. (v. 5) ; but no person was without one. Let us observe, that the gift of ‘ interpretation of tongues, is perfectly distinct from that of speaking with tongues ; by which we learn, that unless some other person who had the gift of interpretation were present, or that the person who spoke with tongues, had *also* the *separate* gift of interpretation of tongues, the meaning of what was uttered could not be conveyed to the hearers. And also, that if the gift of tongues were used in the church for addressing foreigners, the gift of ‘ interpretation would not have been required. The gift of tongues was then a ‘ manifestation,’ that a power was within the person, distinct from himself, and making use of his organs of speech, without his thought, or control. It was a sign of the in-dwelling God—of God dwelling in flesh ; and it stamped authority upon whatever the same individual might pronounce by the Spirit, as the word of the living God.”

We have selected this extract because it collects many of the peculiar opinions of our author, which we desire to consider—it contains many mere assertions, in which we cannot by any means acquiesce. We would take, for example, the following assertion : “ The wisdom and knowledge, and faith here spoken, were not such as we now possess, for we confessedly have not the baptism of the Holy Ghost.” Now, we would refer to what we have already said to prove that it is the privilege of every disciple of Jesus to have the baptism of the Holy Ghost ; and through the influence of that Holy Ghost, to have a measure of divine wisdom, knowledge, and faith—such a measure as the Spirit divides to each person severally as he will. Is it because we

confessedly have not the gifts of "healing," "working of miracles," "divers kind of tongues," &c. that therefore we have not wisdom and knowledge from the same Spirit? Does he not say himself, that all have not the same gift? Does not the Apostle say, that all disciples have not all gifts? How, then, does it follow, that because we have not miraculous gifts, such as divers tongues, we therefore have not wisdom or knowledge, &c.? *"If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not."*

But probably wisdom and knowledge here may not mean the gracious wisdom and knowledge which is the privilege of every believer, but special qualifications for offices in the Christian church—a peculiar measure of these endowments suited to the particular situations in which individuals may be placed. We read in this same 12th chapter, that God "gave some Apostles, prophets, teachers." Now, though we have no apostles in the church, God surely has not left his church without teachers? and surely to those to whom God hath given to be "teachers," he hath not ceased to give "wisdom and knowledge," in some measure, to qualify them for this office. It is not from themselves that any teachers in the present, or any former day, have had wisdom rightly to divide the word of truth, so as to convince sinners or to build up saints. The Lord has been with the teachers whom he hath sent, and will be with them "always, even to the end of the world."

There is another assertion, a mere assertion, in which we cannot acquiesce. "One person might have more than one gift, but no person was without one." Now, taking gift in the sense in which our author uses it, we deny his assertion. We insist that all were baptized with the Spirit, all received the Spirit, because if a man had not the Spirit of Christ he was none of his; but we deny that there is any proof that every believer had some miraculous power of the Holy Spirit. We would quote the 28th verse of this chapter, "And God hath set *some* in the church; first, apostles; secondly, prophets," &c.: these were as the different limbs of the body, the hands, the feet, the eyes, &c., but there was besides the trunk of the body; so there were in the church the variously qualified members bearing several offices, and qualified for those offices; but there was besides the trunk of the body, the mass of the people, the recipients through those who are as hands, and feet, and eyes, and ears. It is very easy for a man quietly to assert that every individual possessed some supernatural gift of the Spirit, but the Scripture says no such thing, the 28th verse seems to say the contrary, and the whole analogy of the figures used leads to a different conclusion. We proceed to another assertion with regard to the gift of tongues: "That unless some other person who had the gift of interpretation were present, or that the person who spoke with tongues had also the separate gift of interpretation of tongues, the meaning of what was uttered could not be conveyed to the

hearers." This is a most extraordinary and groundless assertion. What ! that no man by the gift of tongues ever spoke intelligibly to others!! Surely, to the multitudes who assembled on the day of Pentecost, who heard the Apostles speak in their own tongue, wherein they were born, the wonderful works of God, there was conveyed the meaning of what was uttered. How could it be otherwise ? If the people heard them speak, in their own tongue, they must have understood them. If they spoke the Latin language, the strangers of Rome must have understood them. If they spoke the Arabic, the Arabians must have understood their own tongue. What can induce a man of common sense to make so strange an assertion ? But it is only a step towards a point which our author is especially desirous, if possible, to establish, that the person speaking under a gift of tongues, did not himself understand what he said ; and, to make full way for this point, our author makes the last assertion in the extract we have quoted :—

"The gift of tongues was then a 'manifestation,' that a power was within the person, distinct from himself, and making use of his organs of speech, without his thought, or control. It was a sign of the in-dwelling God—of God dwelling in flesh ; and it stamped authority upon whatever the same individual might pronounce by the Spirit, as the word of the living God."

That we may at once grapple with this subject, we shall pass on to the xiv chapter, and bring forward some statements there made by our author on the subject, and we would turn to his exposition of the 14th verse of chapter xiv. "For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful." Upon this verse we have the following remarks :—

"This verse shows that the spirit of the gifted person was enriched, by the exercise of the gifts, while his understanding was perfectly dormant, and his intellect uninformed, as to the meaning of the utterance. Thus we not only learn that a person gifted to speak in a tongue, was incapable of conveying to others the meaning of what he uttered, without the separate gift of interpretation ; but that he actually did not himself understand what he uttered, unless it were brought into the region of his understanding, for the purpose of conveying instruction to others. This separate power of understanding, the Apostle desires for himself, in the next verse. The Holy Ghost made use of a gifted person's organs of speech, to utter certain words, of which, for his personal enjoyment, it was not necessary for him to understand the meaning, as this action of the Holy Ghost upon him, drew him into the closest connexion with God, and conveyed a blessedness to his spirit, while his understanding was unfruitful.

15. "What is it then ? I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also : I will sing with the Spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also."

"The spirit of the gifted person was capable of functions altogether

independent of his own understanding, and capability of making himself understood. He was edified, enriched, blessed, in his spirit, by the action of the Holy Ghost upon him. And his understanding was only called in, to enable him to convey to others that edification, enrichment, and blessing, which, in the privacy of his spirit, he enjoyed. But as all that was to take place in the church,—in the public assembly of believers, should be, not for private, but for public edification, St. Paul desired for himself, (and for the imitation of the Corinthians,) that in whatever way he was enriched, by praying in the Spirit, or singing in the Spirit, he might then, on those public occasions, be enabled to make use of his understanding, to convey to the members of the church, what he so blessedly enjoyed in his spirit.

16. “‘ Else, when thou shalt bless with the Spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say, Amen, at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?’

17. “‘ For thou verily givest thanks, well ; but the other is not edified.’

18. “‘ I give thanks to (or offer praise to) my God, speaking with tongues more than ye all.’

19. “‘ Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue.’”

Now, if an unprejudiced person, one who had no system to uphold, was to read these verses, we conceive he could not interpret them in any other way, than as enjoining that men should speak in the church what they understood themselves of course ; but, further, what their hearers also understood. How a man can be said to pray with the Spirit, or his spirit to pray, if he did not understand what he was saying ; if he was not conscious whether the sounds he was uttering contained a prayer or not, we cannot conceive. Still further, how he could be said to “give thanks well,” if he attached no meaning to his words, we cannot conceive. But indeed, until the present day, no class of expositors that we know of, ever preached the notion of Christians speaking by the Spirit, words which neither speaker nor hearer understood, except the Roman Catholics. They, to justify the use of Latin prayers by persons knowing no Latin, gave this interpretation to the words ; they, as well as our author, have spoken of the Spirit being edified, by pouring forth sounds to which the man attached no meaning, and declares that a poor peasant of this country can receive spiritual good by reciting Latin prayers, of which he does not understand one word. We refer to the notes on this chapter in the first edition of the *Rhemish Testament*. But our author further speaks of “a power within the person distinct from himself, and making use of his organs of speech without his thought or control.” How can this be, when the Apostle gives directions according to which the gifted person is to control the exercise of the gift ? What ! was the man in whom was a spirit over whom he had no control, to control that spirit ? Could he con-

trol the spirit of God? and yet we read the following directions:—

27. “‘ If any man speak in an *unknown* tongue, let it be by two, or at most by three, and let one interpret.’

28. “‘ But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church, and let him speak to himself, and to God.’

29. “‘ Let the prophets speak two, or three, and let the other judge.’

30. “‘ If any thing be revealed to one that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace.’

31. “‘ For ye may all prophesy, one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted.’

32. “‘ And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.’ ”

Our author says, the prophets have no control over the spirit speaking in them in a tongue; the Apostle here says, the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. They cannot both be right, we must say our author is evidently wrong. Indeed, to our plain common-sense notion of things, this assertion of our author's appears full of the most palpable absurdity, of which we are surprised that he should not be sensible, that a spirit within a man should make use of his organs of speech without his thought or control, and yet that man should be said to speak to God, to pray with the spirit, and to give thanks well!! This is really monstrous. We cannot understand how the man himself can, with his heart, say, Amen, to his own giving of thanks, offered without his thought, any more than the unlearned private man who understandeth not what he sayeth. Our author, in his introduction, requests his readers “to forget whilst they are engaged in the examination of his pages, that pretensions are made to the possession of the gifts which are treated of in the chapters under consideration, by any persons in the present day.” But we feel assured he has not forgotten them, he has been unconsciously warped in his judgment by his knowledge of the facts that certain persons of whom he desires to think favourably, profess to speak by the Spirit a language which neither they nor any other persons understand. We believe that no persons have ever given this interpretation of these passages *a priori*; no persons who had not an interest in defending those who professed to speak by the Spirit what they did not understand, that is, none but either Roman Catholic commentators who were interested to defend Latin prayers by uneducated people, or defenders of the professed possessors of gifts of the present day. It is not unworthy of remark, that, whilst the fact of men uneducated speaking at once some foreign known language, would be a palpable manifestation of the presence of the Spirit of God, just as was the case on the day of Pentecost, the professing to speak by a spirit making use of the man's organs of speech without his thought or control, and therefore uttering things which neither speaker nor hearer could understand, is

exactly what an impostor could and would do safely, without danger of detection. He says he is speaking by the Spirit of God. No one knows but himself by what spirit he speaks; he does what any impostor could do; there is, in the manifestation itself, no evidence in favour of his assertion: the hearer never could be led to say, "No man could do the miracles which thou doest, except God were with him."

We must now return back to the exposition of the xiii chapter, beginning with the introduction to the chapter as it is in the last verse of the xii:—

31. "But covet earnestly the best gifts, and yet show I unto you a more excellent way."

"The literal translation of this verse is as follows: 'Zealously desire the gifts—the better; and yet, (or now) as to the hyperbole, (of the gifts) I show unto you the way.' As if he had said, 'The gifts already spoken of, are gifts of power from the Holy Ghost. But His very best gift—His gift *par excellence*, (*καὶ ὑπερβολὴν*) is that which I will now direct you to, namely, LOVE;' not what we would call the ordinary love of Christians; but, love, the first, and best, of the gifts."

We beg to dissent entirely from the "literal translation," as our author calls it. It appears to us a most unscholarlike perversion of the meaning, which is much better given by our own version. There is no ground for separating *καθ' υπερβολὴν* from *οδόν*. It is never used in the New Testament, as he would suppose it used in this place, by itself. It is used five times, always connected with a verb or a noun, as, Rom. vii. 13, translated "exceeding sinful;" 2 Cor. i. 8, "we were pressed above measure;" 2 Cor. iv. 17, "a far more exceeding weight of glory." It is in unison with these examples, that we have, in the present instance, "a more excellent way," which we venture to assert is the more excellent translation and the more literal.

The object here, and throughout the comment on chapter xiii, is to make it appear that love is not a gracious influence from the Spirit of God upon all believers, and, therefore, shed in its degree upon the believers of the present day, but the best of the gifts in the most strict sense of gifts, so that those who are without the miraculous gifts, must, according to him, be without the gift of love, as he says:—

"Those persons who inquire why 'the gifts' should be desired in the present day, are referred, in answer, to the Apostle's description of that love which is the best of the gifts, and which follows:

4. "'Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself; is not puffed up.'

5. "'Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil:'

6, "'Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.'

7. " ' Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.' "

To point out the gross error which our author has fallen into in identifying love with the possession of gifts, we need only refer to what our author himself has said as to the essential nature of gifts, in his comment on chapter xii. verse 7 :—

7. " ' But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to *each person* to profit withal.' "

" This word, ' manifestation,' leads us to the root of the subject of the spiritual gifts. We learn from it, that in every one who was baptized with the Holy Ghost, there was a *power, manifested*, so evidently the power of God, that it could not be concealed, nor mistaken for natural power. To possess the gift of the Holy Ghost, was not to have made a certain measure of personal religious attainment ; but to be so possessed by the Holy Ghost, that a *manifestation* of his in-dwelling presence should be palpable, by some outward demonstration of power.

We freely admit that the most excellent and most high exercise of divine power is to produce love in the cold, selfish heart of fallen man ; but we deny that wherever there is love, the in-dwelling presence is palpable, by an outward demonstration of power. Love fails of an agreement with the definition which our author himself has given of that manifestation which is essential to a "gift." Love is, according to the Apostle to the Galatians, "*the fruit of the Spirit*," but is no more a "gift," than "joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance."

We would call attention to the 8th, 9th, and 10th verses of this chapter, and to our author's remarks on them ; and then we would point out some particulars in the language of the original, which our author has entirely overlooked, and which will lead to a very different conclusion from that to which he would conduct his reader :—

8. " ' Love never faileth : but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail ; whether there be tongues, they shall cease ; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.

9. " ' For we know in part, and we prophecy in part.

10. " ' But when that which is perfect is come, THEN that which is in part shall be done away.'

" The Apostle here states the comparative duration of the gifts, and of love. The gifts are only adapted to a state of imperfection ; and can only be exercised where there is ignorance to be removed, or sickness to be healed. They must cease, accordingly, ' when that which is perfect is come.' But has that which is perfect yet come ? Is there no ignorance to be removed, nor sickness to be healed ? Assuredly there is. Then, should the gifts not be considered as useless. They are intended for the church, till that which is perfect comes ; and what these words mean, is explained in verse 12, to be—till we see Jesus ' face to face,' and ' know, even as we are

known.' Then, and not till then, should the gifts cease. They are the effects of the in-dwelling of the Comforter—the Holy Ghost, who was to take the place of Christ, in the church, during his absence. But though the gifts of prophecy, of tongues, of knowledge, &c. were to cease when Christ returned to the church, because the church would then be in her perfection, not so was the constraining principle by which they were exercised. Love is adapted to a state of perfection, as well as of imperfection; it must therefore survive the imperfect state; and is thus proved to be of more value than any, or all, the other endowments combined. It is the best of all;—confers its impetus to all;—and shall survive all."

There is an accuracy of expression in the original departed from in our translation of these verses, and a confusion is introduced by using the same words in the translation in places where different words are used in the original, and different words in the translation, in places where the same words are used in the original. To be accurate, we would translate the verses thus:—

8. "Love never falleth out (of the church); but whether there be prophecies, they shall be abolished; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall be abolished (*καταργησεται*.)"

9. "For we know in part, and we prophecy in part."

10. "But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be abolished (*καταργησεται*.)"

Now, it is to be remarked, that a different thing is said of the ending of "tongues," from what is said of the ending of prophecy and knowledge: tongues shall cease, but prophecy and knowledge shall be abolished or rendered useless—as the original literally means, by the introduction of that which is perfect; from which it appears that there always will be in the church a partial prophesying or opening, through the Spirit of God, of the Scriptures to edification; and a partial knowledge of mysteries, through the light of the same Spirit, till that partial light gives way to the bright light that shall accompany the appearing of Christ, called, 2d Thess. ii. 8, "the brightness of his coming." But it is not said of tongues, that they shall be brought to an end by the introduction of that which is perfect; but simply, they shall cease—*when*, is not declared. For any thing said here, it may be they were intended to "cease" in the early ages of the church, which we know to be the fact.

We have thus briefly noticed the principal points in this pamphlet, the publication of which we do exceedingly lament. In drawing our remarks to a conclusion, we cannot but notice the conclusion arrived at by our author:—

"From all that has been adduced, we draw this conclusion, that being able to form no other idea of an apostolic church, than as the model of such a church is presented in Scripture, and knowing no one church at present which is not as different from such model, as twilight is from meridian day,

THE WHOLE CHURCH IS IN APOSTACY—THE WHOLE CHURCH IS BABYLON—THE CITY OF CONFUSION; THERE IS NOW NO VISIBLE CHURCH, FOR GOD IS NOT MANIFESTED IN ANY.—When we say there is no visible church, we mean not to imply that there are no Christians to be seen, who are members of the mystical body of Christ, which is called the church; such, of course, there are, though we greatly fear their number is not near so large as is generally imagined. The standard of religion is now so low, that neither cross nor inconvenience attend its profession; therefore numbers join it, and are considered Christians, whose religion stands in the wisdom, and teaching of man, and not in the power of God. This could not be the case when the gifts were an evidence of union between the members and their Head; and when the church was by them separated from the world. But taking our definition of ‘A CHURCH,’ or church-body, from what we collect in Scripture, to be—a body of saints, or holy persons, in which body, *all* the believers in that place were to be found;—in whom, as in a temple, the Holy Ghost dwelt manifestly, and among whom He spoke audibly, for rule and direction;—whose members were variously gifted, for mutual edification; and who were governed by teachers endowed by the Spirit,—with such we certainly are not acquainted. Such was a visible church, wholly separate from the world;—a city set upon an hill, that could not be hid. It may seem a presumptuous conclusion at which we have arrived; and yet if the premises are scripturally true, the conclusion is inevitable.”

We only say again to this, as we have said before, that our author has entirely failed to prove that such a church as he has here described ever existed, even in the times of which the Scriptures give us an account. But we would notice particularly his sweeping assertion, that the whole church is in apostacy—the whole church is Babylon.

Again, he says :—

“Some churches are deeper in the apostacy than others, but we are all in the condemnation. Upon the church at large, thus sunk in apostacy, we believe the judgment of the Lord will be speedily outpoured. The whole church—the whole of Christendom, we believe to be THE BABYLON, to be destroyed by fiery judgment for its apostacy, at the second, and speedy coming of the Lord, as the Jewish church was destroyed for its apostacy, at His first coming; with this difference, that as theirs was only ‘blasphemy against the Son of Man,’ it might be forgiven; whereas the apostacy of the Christian church will end in ‘blasphemy against the Holy Ghost’—a denial, and rejection of the *power* of the Holy Ghost, which cannot be forgiven; and, therefore, while the Jew, who denied the Son, might afterwards be admitted to the dispensation of the Spirit, the professing Christian, who denies the power of the Holy Ghost, has nothing to expect but ‘a fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses’ law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath

counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite to the *Spirit of grace*."

Here it is evident that the reason why our author declares the whole church to be Babylon is, because the whole church is now devoid of the manifestation of the Spirit. If our author had ever so much right to blame the church for being destitute of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit—if this point was conceded; yet what right would he have on that account to call her Babylon? Babylon is not a term which our author has a right to select himself, in order to express a system which he dislikes and condemns. Babylon is a scripture term—it is a name which the Spirit of God has thought fit to apply to a particular system of evil, giving at the same time a description of some of the features of that evil. The question to be asked, naturally, is this—Is that, on account of which our author calls the whole church Babylon—Is that, in the Scriptures, stated as the characteristic of Babylon? Is Babylon ever described as the church devoid of the outward manifestations of the Spirit? Is this even among the evils ascribed to her by the pen of inspiration? No; never. But again, it may well be asked, is the whole church guilty of the evils ascribed to Babylon? Is the whole church drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus? Was this question put to our author with regard to any Protestant churches, he must, with all his desire to inculcate them, answer—No. We must say, then, he has no right to call them Babylon. And we feel ourselves called upon to protest loudly against this vicious way of dealing with Scripture—not taking it in the sense in which it is evidently used by the inspired penmen, but in a sense wantonly given to it to suit a system. We can hardly conceive the possibility of any person reading what is said of Babylon in the Revelation, and really getting up from it and saying, this means the whole church. It is a grievous evil when men derive not their systems from the Scripture, but force the language of the Scripture to suit their system.

Our author in another place, says, (p. 110,) "that the want of the Spirit, *in power*, is the leading feature of the apostacy of 'the last days,'" referring to 2 Tim. iii.; whilst in another place he admits that there is no proof of the presence of miraculous powers after the third century. How can that be a characteristic feature of the church in "the last days," which has belonged to her for fifteen centuries?

We have not space for further remarks. The importance of the subject, and the acknowledged high character of the author of the pamphlet before us, can alone apologize for the length to which we have gone. We feel a consciousness that we have not set down aught in malice—that we entertain not towards the author any feelings but those of Christian love and esteem. We know his worth, and in proportion we mourn over his delusion;

and desire to use our humble endeavours, looking for the blessing of God, to lead him to a sounder frame of mind, and to prevent his being an instrument to confuse or pervert others.

These are times of great excitement, and when there is a demand for novelty, extravagance, and enthusiasm; and we are sorry to say, that in this commodity, as well as others, the demand produces a supply. When the public are disposed to give a favourable hearing to novelty and extravagance—when there is established almost an annual exhibition of eccentricity and *originality*—there are minds that will be goaded by the stimulus; and, becoming first bewildered themselves, will be in danger of becoming instruments to bewilder and confuse others. We are glad when any of these persons, possessed, as they think, of new and superior views, honestly and fearlessly give them to the public in print. They can then be examined with coolness, and brought fairly to the test of the law and the testimony.

MISSIONARY RESEARCHES IN ARMENIA.*

TIME was, and not long since, when the only ideas associated with missionaries and missions, by those who directed public opinion in matters of science and literature, were those of incorrigible ignorance and dreamy wrongheadedness about all the subjects interesting to those conversant only with the things of this world; and when to speak of the enlargement of the boundaries of discovery, or the addition of any thing valuable to the acquisitions of ingenuity or research from that quarter, would have been to secure for him who should have hazarded the supposition, the character of a senseless enthusiast himself. If there was one thing more absurd than another, in the estimation of these pretenders to the exclusive possession of sagacity and wisdom, it was to expect that "any good thing" could come out of missionary boards, and committees, and directors; and if any of the newly-fledged witlings wanted a subject by which to

* *Missionary Researches in Armenia*: including a Journey through Asia Minor, and into Georgia and Persia, with a Visit to the Nestorian and Chaldean Christians of Oormiah and Salmas. By Eli Smith and H. G. O. Dwight, Missionaries from the American Board of Missions. To which is prefixed, A Memoir on the Geography and Ancient History of Armenia. By the Author of "The Modern Traveller." 8vo. London: Wightman. Dublin: William Curry, Jun. & Co.

secure a laugh from the *then* "reading public," he had only to try his hand on "the missionary cause." We are not sure whether—without detracting one tittle from the stupidity of these would-be-wise men, who could not distinguish between a good cause and its mistaken friends, or from their criminal malignity, if they could—there was not afforded, if not *cause*, at least *some occasion* for these manifestations, in the well-meant, but injudicious views and measures of some in the incipient stage of the modern missionary enterprise. They may have been too prone to overlook the qualifications for the work, which education and learning, operating upon strong intellect and sound understanding, could impart, in the exclusive regard to those certainly higher endowments of faith, and zeal, and single-hearted devotedness, which the Spirit of God alone can bestow: and measures may have been adopted, and plans laid down, more in accordance with the expectation of something approximating the miraculous, than what the sober calculations of wisdom, prudence, and reason might lead to anticipate. It is not uncommon, in the commencement of any mighty and untried enterprise, for spirits, qualified to undertake it by their unquenchable faith and indomitable ardour, to be so absorbed by the enterprise itself, and the principle that only He whose glory is sought can give success, and that He can, in spite of obstacles,—to overlook, to a certain extent, the necessity for cool deliberation and careful calculation, and mature plans and precautionary measures; and this, too, while the history of the deeds of the mighty men of former days, who extended into distant, and unknown, and barbarous regions the holy and civilizing influence of the Gospel—and even the records of the earliest missionaries, in whom miraculous gifts supplied the place of the indispensable endowments of all succeeding times, might have guarded them against such a one-sided view of the business they undertook. But whether any portion of *occasion* may have been furnished by the friends of missions to those who "desired occasion" for traducing the cause, its agents, directors, and advocates; or whether in the ignorance and malignity of the traducers themselves,—unmitigated, inexcusable, and alone the cause was to be found, certain it is, that a singular and delightful revolution has taken place. With the exception of the low and utterly contemptible radical and infidel, and popish ephemeral press, whose claims to literature are upon a par with their love of order and excellence, no tirades against missions now disgrace the periodical literature of our country; nor would public opinion now tolerate attacks, which, a quarter of a century ago, elicited plaudits for the leading reviews of the day.

Now, we rejoice in this, as proof of a more salutary and healthful state of the public mind in reference to these matters; as indicating a gradual and very gratifying advancement of religious knowledge, and, with it, interest in its extension in the world; and as giving hope of happier days, than certain portents in the

moral atmosphere would prognosticate :* but we must add, that it could not be otherwise, unless men were to make up their minds to disclaim all pretensions to common sense, as well as to religion. We claim, on the score of strict justice, a place for many of our modern missionaries, second to none of our modern travellers—on the ground of the very requisites on which mere travellers pique themselves, and wholly irrespective of the qualifications which the missionaries have as peculiarly their own. Whether we wish for graphic sketches of national character and customs—luminous descriptions of natural scenery—geographical and historical details, we know of no books of the kind more interesting than *Missionary Travels*; while, as every thing they record is viewed with a Christian's eye, and exhibited in its bearings on the immortal destinies of our fellow-men, there is superadded that charm to the believing philanthropist, which is too seldom found in the works of other travellers. Where, on all accounts, can we find more interesting travels than the works of Jowett or Ellis; of Tyerman and Bennett; of Hartley and Latrobe; of Gutzlaff and Heber—for him, too, we claim as a missionary bishop; not to mention scores besides, and though last, not least, Arundel's *Researches in Asia Minor*.

While missionaries in general have thus been enlarging the bounds of knowledge, our American friends have been rivalling us in these undertakings. The shores of the Mediterranean had been traversed by missionaries from the Transatlantic West. King, Fisk, and Parsons, had made the tour of that part of Asia Minor which includes the seven churches:† Fisk and King, with others, ascended the Nile to Thebes, and afterwards traversed Palestine and Syria; and others travelled over Smyrna, Cappadocia, the Morea, the Greek Islands, and the coast of Tripoli and Tunis. Their researches had added much to our authentic information as to the Greek, Coptic, and Maronite churches.

The present volume, however, contains the records of the travels of two of our Transatlantic missionaries into countries more interesting still,—because, in a religious point of view, in a great measure unknown. Before their tour no *direct* communication had been opened, by any Protestant missionaries, with the Armenian church; and the country itself, though traversed

* We need not say that we do not allude to the recent political changes.

† We cannot refuse ourselves the satisfaction of recommending to our readers, on this truly interesting region, Arundel's *Researches in Asia Minor*; a work whose investigations and learning are equalled only by its Christian spirit. We have perused his volumes with unmingled satisfaction. Much of the region he describes has been, in modern times, *terra incognita*; and to the student of classical and sacred literature equally will his researches be acceptable and valuable. They contain such a mine of what is interesting, and has not been, heretofore, made public, that we should not wonder if we were to introduce hereafter some portions of them to the readers of the EXAMINER.

by the high route leading from Constantinople to Tabriz and the Persian capital, has almost disappeared from our geography. The corner of Persia in which the ancient church of Seleucia survives the revolutions of seventeen centuries, is scarcely less unknown to modern Europeans;—and it has been reserved for two missionaries from another hemisphere, to disclose the actual sentiments and condition of the ancient Nestorians, as they are still found clinging to their ancient faith in the midst of Mussulman barbarism and intolerance.

Such being the character of the volume, we now proceed to give our readers some account of its contents; regretting that we cannot afford them the aid of the very excellent map and memoir prefixed; regret which, for their own sakes, will be diminished by the hope that they will be induced to procure the volume for themselves. With the aid, however, of such map as may be at hand, they may track our travellers from Smyrna to Constantinople,—thence by way of Tokat to Erzroom,—from Erzroom, by Kars, to Tifflis; thence by Shoosha, and some other intermediate places, to Echmiadzin, Tabriz, Salmas; and Oormiah, the high place of Nestorianism: whence they retraced their course to Erzroom, and so by Trebizond, reached Malta. It will, of course, be altogether impossible for us to follow them through so extensive a tour; at every point of which there would be found much information, interesting to the general reader, and still more especially so to the Christian. Being sent out to obtain such information as might lead to the adoption of measures for sending forth labourers into those regions, every thing, however minute, bearing upon the subject, has been observed and recorded: and it is the minute accuracy with which, unvarnishedly, every thing is stated that gives the work its charm and value. We must only glean.

The whole of the introductory letters detailing the tour from Smyrna to Constantinople, and the remarks on the metropolis of the Turkish empire, we must pass, as referring to more commonly trodden ground: but as they set out, on the morning of the 21st of May, 1830, from Stamboul,* with their faces towards Armenia, preferring the inconveniences of travelling under a Tartar guide, to the delays of a caravan. Our readers may like to look at them equipped for their journey, and contrast their comforts with those he is accustomed to in his travels:

“Trunks were too frail and too awkwardly loaded for the rapid mode of

* It is curious to see how modern names used by the Turks, betray their ignorance of the languages of the people they conquered. The name by which the Greeks now commonly call Constantinople, is *ἡ πόλις* (the city), by way of distinction. When going thither they say, *εἰς τὴν πόλιν*, and this expression, pronounced by them *is-tim-bolin*, the Turks have converted into *Istamboul*. In the same way *Isnikmid* is derived from *εἰς Νίκην* and *Isnik* from *εἰς Νίκαιαν*.

travelling we had selected; and we therefore substituted for them two large bags fitted to be attached to each other, and slung one on each side of a horse, two saddle-bags, and two valises, all of thick Russian leather, made impermeable to water by a lining of waxed cloth, and so constructed as to be fastened with a padlock. Mattresses were too bulky, and we took instead of them a carpet and coverlet for each, rolled in a piece of painted canvass, that served to defend them from the rain by day, and answered for a floor, when our lot was to lie on the ground at night. An ample Turkish pelisse in our valises, lined throughout with *chilkufa*, the fur of the Caucasian fox, was at hand to impart its abundant stock of warmth by day or by night, as we might need it. Four copper pans, fitted to each other and fastened together by bars of the same metal, a mill, pot, and cups, for grinding, making, and drinking coffee, with a knife, fork, and spoon for each, and a copper drinking cup, were our utensils for cooking and eating. A circular piece of leather, with iron rings attached to its circumference, and a chain with a hook passing through them, and named a *sufreh*, served, when open and spread upon the ground as a table, and, when drawn up and suspended to a horse, as a bag to carry our bread and cheese. The whole, embracing our clothing, bedding, and table and kitchen furniture, was comprised in a compass that enabled us to carry it, on ordinary occasions, with only one extra horse; so unsparingly did we lop off civilization's factitious additions to the necessities of life, in order, by travelling as nearly as possible in the style of the country, to proceed expeditiously, economically, and with few allurements for robbers. As the Turkish post furnishes only naked horses, we were obliged to add saddles and bridles to our other accoutrements. To our saddle-bow we attached pistols, to answer their usual objects in this country, to make the timid appear bold and formidable. For our own snug dress were substituted the loose robes of the Turk, the European hat was exchanged for the oriental turban, and our feet were encased in the enormous stockings and boots of the Tartar; such an accommodation to the prejudices of the country being deemed expedient, in order to avoid unnecessary notice, expense, and trouble, if not insult. With these preparations we found ourselves completely equipped for a tour in Turkey.

Now, fairly equipped, let the reader next observe how they got on :

"We now *travel tartar* in fine style, and I must invite you to look at us as we move over these naked plains. Two horses, the first led by a surijy upon a separate animal, and the second tied by his halter to the tail of his companion, carry our baggage. Our tartar, with a *karpák* (cap) of black lambskin upon his head, some twelve or fifteen inches in length, looking much like a stove-pipe with a yellow cushion stuffed into its upper extremity, and a heavy kumchy in his hand to give force to his frequent exclamation of *haideh*, rides by their side. We, metamorphosed into Turks, with unshaven lip and turbaned head, bring up the rear. Every stage, often thirty miles or more, is travelled without allowing our horses a drop of water, and our gait was frequently a rapid gallop; in enduring which, the

loaded animals especially exhibit a strength and hardiness that quite astonish us. Besides the smart of the tartar's lash, the weight of their load, and the swiftness of their gait, they are subject to many cruel accidents. A false step in such rapid travelling often causes one to stumble, and the other, tied as he is to him, is most ungently and unceremoniously arrested; or if the ground is hilly, one sometimes rolls down a declivity, and drags his companion reluctantly after him. Their motion is so great, that, snugly as our baggage is packed, not a stage is passed without its turning more than once, so as to bring the girt, sustaining the whole weight of the load, suddenly across the poor animal's back, often already completely excoriated by the chafing of the saddle. Such accidents being frequently the fault of the surij, are apt to bring him into a quarrel with the tartar, in which we have more than once seen the yataghan, instead of the kumchy, applied to his back.

"Beyond Karajalár the same table-land continued, and our party moved over it, often nineteen abreast, upon an almost unbroken gallop for three hours to Karajulén, where we stopped at 7 P.M. Had you seen us, loaded horses and all, bounding over the plain as if for a wager, the scene would have amused you; unless perchance pity for the poor animals had produced an opposite impression. We should ourselves have dealt more mercifully with the poor beasts, and in fact with their riders, had we been our own masters. But, with a level road and good horses, the irresistible tendency of a tartar is onward; and our Mohammed aga had no moderate share of the propensity of his profession. Having as usual anticipated us a little, he awaited our arrival at the post-house, and, as we drove up in good spirits after a ride of at least 60 miles since the morning, exclaimed to his friends, *el hamd lillah alushdular* (thank God they have got used to it), highly gratified by such a proof that we were now able to push on as fast as he wished. This place contains about 200 houses, all Turkish."

A specimen of their lodging accommodations we must append, lest there should be excited envy at the comforts of those men,—who, not so luxuriously, take pleasure trips off the funds of those who support them,—and then proceed to matters more germane:

"Our village consisted of 10 or 12 Turkish houses. Its name I did not record, but I retain a most distinct impression of our lodgings. It was concluded that we should be more comfortable in the house of an old gentleman and lady, than in the stable where the rest of our company lodged. A description of it will give you an idea of the underground houses of Armenia in general, except that this was one of the smallest and poorest. You have only to increase the number and size of the rooms, and you have a picture of the best, whether Turkish or Armenian. It was formed by digging into the side of a hill, so as completely to bury in it three of the walls, and leave only enough of the fourth exposed in front to admit of a doorway. Upon the terrace was thrown a mound of dirt, that restored the hill almost to its original shape, and gave a front view resembling the burrow of some animal. Its walls were of rough round stones; its terrace was of

unhewn branches of trees, blackened by being intentionally burnt to preserve them, or incidentally smoked by the daily fire; and its floor was the naked ground. It consisted of but one room, eighteen or twenty feet square, around which were scattered a variety of kitchen and dairy furniture. By the side of a post was a cheese pressing between two stones. A bag of yoghoort was suspended from a straggling stick that contributed to form the terrace. In another part hung a cylindrical churn, some six feet long. In the centre, a hole in the ground did, when heated, the service of an oven. In a corner stood two calves. Our aged host, having built a fire, and spread for us carpets and cushions, straightened himself and ejaculated, *La illah illa Allah, Mohammed resool Allah*, (there is no god but God, Mohammed is the apostle of God,) in a tone that indicated some feeling of the vanity of the world. He left his house and all its stores entirely to us for the night, and, thankful even for such lodgings, we slept soundly."

The whole number of the Armenian nation has been computed at two millions. The greater number are under the Ottoman dominion; the remainder, except the few that have wandered in mercantile pursuits, are inhabitants of the Russian and Persian provinces. They have retained the name; but, with few exceptions, little more than the name of Christians. True, they have been the objects of papal solicitude; but, with the exception of submission to the Pope, there is little in Popery to which they require to be converted. Heartless forms have taken the place of vital religion; superstition and idolatry have supplanted the pure and simple worship and services of the primitive disciples; and therefore it will not be hard to conjecture the state of the outward conduct, when estimated by the word of God. Education is almost unknown, except the few who are taught reading as a qualification for assisting in the public forms of the church; female education altogether so. But, with all this, there is a pertinacity as inveterate in clinging to old usages as *the all* of religion, and a contempt, and often a hatred, of those who have not the true Shibboleth, as among our own miserable devotees in Kerry or Cunnemara. The time and mode of fasting, and the way of making the sign of the cross, were the first questions usually put to our travellers, to ascertain if they were Christians, and of the right sort. Here we must give a brief extract:—

"The Armenians have an extreme veneration for the original cross, on which our Saviour was crucified; attributing to it powers of intercession with God, and of defending from evil, and believing it to be the sign of the Son of Man, that, at the judgment, will appear in the heavens coming out of the east, and shining even into the west. In imitation of it, many crosses are made of metal, and other materials to be used in churches and elsewhere. To consecrate them, they are washed in water and wine, in imitation of the water and the blood that flowed from our Saviour's side, and anointed with merion, in token of the Spirit that descended and rested

upon him ; suitable passages are read from the Psalms, the Prophets, the Epistles, and the Gospels ; and then the priest prays, ' That God may give to this cross the power of that to which he was himself nailed, so that it may cast out devils, may heal the diseases of men, and appease the wrath that descends from heaven on account of our sins, to remain upon it himself always, as upon his original cross, and make it his temple and throne, and the weapon of his power, so that our worship before it may be offered not to created matter, but to Him, the only invisible God.' After a cross has undergone this ceremony, it may be set up toward the east, as an object of worship and prayer, while to treat an unconsecrated one thus, would be idolatry, and a downright breach of the second commandment. For, by the act of consecration, Christ is inseparably united to it, and it becomes his ' throne,' his ' chariot,' and his ' weapon,' for the conquest of Satan, so that, though it is honoured on these accounts, the worship is not given to it, but to Him who is on it. The bodily eye sees the material cross, but the spiritual eye sees the divine power that is united with it. ' Therefore,' says a distinguished Armenian writer, ' thou believer in God, when thou seest the cross, know and believe that thou seest Christ reclining upon it ; and when thou prayest before the cross, believe that thou art talking with Christ, and not with dumb matter. For it is Christ that accepts the worship which thou offerest to the cross, and it is he that hears the prayer of thy mouth, and fulfils the petitions of thy heart, which thou askest in faith.'

" Besides these images of the cross, they also, like all non-protestant Christians, frequently make the sign of the cross, and to this the priest referred in the conversation I have reported. Crossing one's self, they are taught to believe, is the mark of a Christian, in such a sense, that, as a shepherd knows his sheep by their mark, so Christ knows the sheep of his flock by their crossing themselves. The apostles first introduced this ceremony, they say ; and parents are urged to teach it to their children the first thing, lest the greater part of the sin of their making it incorrectly through life fall upon them. By it they profess to signify, first, a belief in the Trinity, as the three persons of it are named ; and, second, the mediatorial work of Christ, as bringing the hand from the forehead to the stomach, represents his descent from heaven to earth, and bringing it from the left to the right breast, that he delivered the souls that were in hades, and made them worthy of heaven. They make it at every falling and rising in time of prayer, and on many other occasions ; such as beginning an important business, going to bed at night, rising in the morning, dressing, washing, eating, drinking, going out at night, or entering any dangerous place. The benefits they expect from it are, that it will make their prayers acceptable, and their work easy ; that it will defend them from the wiles of evil spirits, and give them strength to war against sin."

Prayers and masses for the dead have been substituted for the exhibition of Christ crucified to the living ; and other mediators have so excluded Christ, that a trace of his intercession is not to be found in their devotions. Even when the name of Jesus is

mentioned, it is for the sake of his mother, or of some saint, he is requested to accept the worshipper; and the visible representation, or image of Christ, is substituted for the spiritual view of him, which the Holy Spirit imparts through his illumination by the truth.

It is interesting to contrast with their moral condition, that of some German colonies, that some twenty years since have been settled in Georgia. Of these, and the origin of their settlement, the following accounts will be read with pleasure:—

“The causes which led to the establishment of the German colonies in Georgia, and their present state, deserve a moment's attention; in fact, we were directed by our instructions to make them a particular object of inquiry. They owe their origin to extravagant views respecting the millennium. Some years ago, several popular and ardent ministers in the kingdom of Wurtemberg maintained, in commentaries on the Apocalypse and in other publications, that that wished-for period would commence in 1836, and would be preceded by a dreadful apostacy and great persecutions. These views, in addition to the fascinating interest always connected with prophetic theories, being enforced with much pious feeling, acquired so great credit, as to be adopted by nearly all the religious people in the kingdom, and by many others. At the same time, the advocates of the neological system being the predominant party in the clergy, succeeded in effecting some alterations in the prayers and hymns of the church, in accommodation to their errors. This grieved exceedingly all who were attached to evangelical principles, and was taken to be the commencement of the apostacy they expected. Their prophetic teachers had intimated, that, as in the destruction of Jerusalem, the Christians found a place of refuge, so would there be one now, and that somewhere in the vicinity of the Caspian Sea. Many, therefore, of the common people, determined to seek the wished-for asylum, that they and their children (for whom the better sort were particularly anxious) might escape the impending storm, and also be able to form an independent ecclesiastical establishment according to their own notions. To these were joined others desirous of change, or in straitened circumstances, who, though not at heart pious, professed for the time to be influenced by the same principles and motives. In fact, the latter finally became the most numerous. The company, when it left Wurtemberg, consisted of 1500 families. But no adequate arrangement having been made for the journey, and the sinister motives of the majority contributing to create disorder, they suffered exceedingly on the way, and before they reached Odessa two-thirds had died. There they found a large number of their countrymen, and received a reinforcement of 100 families.

“They reached Georgia in 1817, and settled in seven colonies. One, divided into two villages, called Marienfeld and Petersdorf, is on the Iori in Kakheti; two others, New Tiflis and Alexandersdorf, are on the left bank of the Koor near Tiflis; two more, Elizabeththal and Katherinenfeld, are in Somkheti, not far from the same city; and Anenfeld and Helenendorf are here in the vicinity of Gánjeh.

"The arrival of the German missionaries in Georgia, in the spring of 1823, was the commencement of some ecclesiastical order among them. They were found entirely without pastors, and deplorably destitute of religious privileges; and those gentlemen, induced by their earnest request, as well as by their condition, devoted to them the whole of their first summer. Then, finding that too much of their attention was thus called away from the proper object of their mission, they wrote to their society to send out a man specially for the colonists; and the Rev. Mr. Saltet was accordingly commissioned for this purpose. They received him with joy; but another pastor arriving soon after, with a commission from the German consistory of St. Petersburg, they were of course immediately resigned into his hands. Although the latter was an evangelical man, the colonists, having fled from Germany to escape a similar ecclesiastical authority, declared that they were under no consistory, and would have nothing to do with him. In support of their pretensions, they appealed to a promise to that effect from the Emperor Alexander, which he had probably given, at least verbally. An account of the whole matter was sent to the consistory by their delegate; but before it was settled he died. About this time, Count Diebitch, who has since so distinguished himself in the Turkish war, arrived in Georgia. Being himself a Protestant, he took a deep interest in the colonies, and entered into the most full consultations with Mr. Saltet respecting their ecclesiastical affairs. At the suggestion of Diebitch, they were assembled in a council, and the plan of a separate religious establishment was drawn up, with the aid of the missionaries, and presented to the emperor. He consequently granted, that, agreeably to their request, they should be independent of the consistory; that they should be supplied with pastors from the society of Basle; and that Mr. Saltet should be the spiritual inspector of the whole. He also gave them 27,000 silver roubles (about 20,250 dollars) for the erection of a church and a parsonage in every colony, and 250 silver roubles (about 187 dollars) per annum for the support of each pastor. Two pastors, in addition to Mr. Saltet, had already arrived when we were in Georgia; one of whom was settled in Elizabeththal, and the other not yet located. We have also, since, met two others, one at Constantinople, and one at Malta, on their way. Mr. Saltet's lamented death I have already mentioned. Subsequently, the Rev. Mr. Dittich, at the request of the minister at St. Petersburg, addressed first to himself, and then to his society, was appointed to his place. Rejoiced as we were that the colonies should obtain a spiritual director, so well qualified by talents and piety, and an intimate acquaintance from the beginning with all their spiritual concerns, we could not but sympathise with him, in the trial his feelings endured in view of the consequent interruption of his labours among the Armenians; and are, on the whole, gratified to learn, that the arrangement is likely to be overruled in favour of his remaining at Shoosha.

"When the missionaries first arrived among the colonists, they were received with open arms, and were delighted to find every mouth full of the most pious conversation. They soon perceived, however, that much of it was a mere show, and that a majority were at heart men of the

world. Still, wherever they preached, some profited, and proved themselves to be branches of the true vine. Under the excellent influence of Mr. Saltet, their spiritual state has improved; and it is hoped they will ultimately exert a most salutary influence upon the natives of the country."

A visit to one of these colonies is thus described:—

"Let us turn from the heartless forms of solemn mockery (already described) to a different scene—simple and devout Protestant worship in the heart of Georgia! Of the seven German colonies in these provinces, whose history will be related hereafter, one, named New Tiflis, is about two versts from the city. It consists of two rows of neatly whitewashed houses of one story, at moderate distances from each other, along a broad and straight street, and contains not far from 200 inhabitants, who have the regular instructions of a minister of the gospel. We had already become acquainted with pastor Saltet, and found him an intelligent and extremely devout man. We felt at our first interview that he was ripe for heaven, but knew not that he would so soon be there. Within a month, he was brought by the cholera, in less than twenty-four hours, from perfect health to the grave. He was the general spiritual inspector of all the colonies, and informed us that some at least of his charge were excellent Christians. As we entered his church, the worshippers were dropping in one by one, and quietly taking their seats, while the devotion in their countenances showed that they felt the solemnity of the duties in which they were about to engage; and the books in their hands testified that they had been instructed to understand as well as to perform them. The prayers of the pastor seemed to breathe the united and heartfelt devotion of all; his sermon was a direct, affectionate, and earnest address to every hearer; and the singing, which affected me more than all, was in good German taste, simple, solemn, and touching. I shall not attempt to describe the feelings awakened by this scene, refreshing as an oasis in a boundless desert, though, in spite of me at the time, they expressed themselves in tears. Since first setting foot in Asia, I had deeply felt that a consistent Christian life, and a devout simple worship, exhibited by a few truly governed by the fear of God, and shining like a candle into all the surrounding darkness, was the great desideratum needed by a missionary to give intelligibility to his instructions, and force to his arguments. How often, without it, had I seemed to myself like an inhabitant of some other planet, vainly endeavouring to model my hearers after characters whom I had seen there, and of whom they could form no conception, or whose existence they could hardly believe! Here, at last, I seemed to have found the desideratum supplied, and was encouraged to hope, that this example of pure religion would be like leaven to all the corrupt and backsliding churches around."

There is every reason to hope that these devoted German missionaries, whom God has heretofore blessed, will be the means of extending widely, throughout these Armenian churches, where

there is a name that they live, and yet are dead, "the knowledge of Christ," which sanctifies and saves; and we trust our American brethren will follow up the researches which these devoted men have made, by acting upon the suggestions which they have given, and sending in labourers for this harvest, which is indeed plenteous, and the labourers are few. The experiment made by the Missionary Society of Basle, in 1821, under the excellent missionaries Dittrich and Zarembo, the seat of which is Shoosha, and of which there is a very interesting account given in this volume, shows what may be done. Schools have been established; the Scriptures translated, and other books prepared; the Gospel preached to Moslems and Armenians: and though persecution was stirred up by Popish emissaries, and their operations, for a season, suspended by war, yet the first fruits have been already reaped, and the harvest seems about to follow soon. We are induced, on this subject, to give the following rather lengthened extracts:—

"It was in 1827, that the missionaries were first assembled at Shoosha, in circumstances to give form to their plans of operation. They were five in number, viz. Dittrich, Zarembo, Haas, Hohenacker, and Pfander. A part of their arrangement was, that Messrs. Zarembo and Pfander, who, together with Mr. Hohenacker, were to labour for the Moslems, should spend most of the year in travelling, and the remainder in visiting the people in the bazárs of Shoosha, or in preparing such books and tracts in the vulgar Turkish dialect, as might be usefully circulated. In prosecution of this plan, Sheky, Shirván, Bakoo, Daghistán as far as Derbénd, Nakhcheván, and Eriván, have been traversed. Recently, also, as has been already related, an extensive tour has been made in Turkey. Persia, which was the primary object of their mission, it was thought superfluous to visit, while so much needed to be done directly around them. Then came the war to prevent any such movement; and after its close, the two newly-acquired provinces claimed prior attention. Recently, Mr. Pfander, in order to make himself familiar with Arabic and Persian, has accompanied Mr. Groves to Bagdad, with the intention of spending some time in Persia. No other visit has been made by them to that country.

"In the preparation of books, they could for a long time find almost no native help. The Armenians were unable to write Turkish, and the Moslems were so reluctant to contribute their aid to the circulation of the opinions of the missionaries, as to consent only with great reluctance even to copy the smallest articles. At length, Providence furnished them with a very competent helper. He was born of Armenian parents, in an obscure village on the Aras, in this province, and was named by them Harütün. During a war between Persia and Russia, in 1810, a Moslem khan of Karadagh, at the head of a horde of robbers, crossed the Aras, plundered his village, and carried him, then a mere boy, into captivity. Mohammedanism, of course, now became his religion, and with it he received the name of

Mirza Ferookh. He was soon sent as a present to one of his master's wives, who resided at Tehran; and she, having recently lost a son about the same age, adopted him as her own child. No pains were spared in his education: the best masters were employed to teach him, and he was instructed in all the literature of Persia. Eight years passed away thus in the enjoyment of uninterrupted maternal partiality and fondness from his new mother, when the khan, heedless of her remonstrances, took him away to be afterwards about his person. For nine years he was the companion of his master, almost constantly travelling in different provinces of the kingdom. But he still remembered his parents and his native village. The last Russian war afforded him an opportunity he had long wished, and, escaping at the hazard of his life, he returned to the home of his childhood. He yet retained his Mohammedanism for a time, but at length embraced again the religion of his fathers. Wishing to add a knowledge of Russian to his other attainments, he came to put himself under the instructions of Mr. Zarembo, at Shoosha, and was thus introduced to the missionaries. As a translator, his qualifications have given them entire satisfaction. He has accompanied Mr. Zarembo in two missionary tours, and proved himself a valuable assistant. Being little attached to the errors of his church, he is a candid receiver of religious instruction. And if not already truly a Christian, the missionaries hope that he is not far from the kingdom of God. Thus, by leading him in a way that he knew not, has Providence prepared him admirably to assist in one of the most important and difficult branches of missionary labour.

"The most gratifying effects of the labours of the missionaries upon individual character have been observed in two deacons, of whom I must be allowed to give some account. They originally belonged to a convent on an island in the lake of Seván. But in search of theological knowledge, they left that convent; and even had so strong a desire for the object of their pursuit, as to form the secret purpose of going to Venice, could they not obtain it nearer. Not finding it at Echmiádzin, where they spent some time, nor being admitted to the school at Tiflis, whither they subsequently went, one of them came to Shoosha, and engaged himself as assistant to Bóghos, while he was principal of the mission school, for the sole compensation of receiving his instructions. Being dismissed by him for some frivolous reason, it came to the knowledge of the missionaries that he was desirous of studying Latin and Greek, and they took him into their family. He subsequently assisted them in their school, and was the pious teacher already alluded to. His name was Moses. He was not long in mentioning his friend to them, and, at their request, he also soon joined them. The two deacons already understood their ancient tongue, and were, in the estimation of their countrymen, learned. But their thirst for additional knowledge was so great, that, notwithstanding the serious difficulties to be encountered from the total want of the requisite elementary works, their progress in Latin and Greek was good, and one of them learned considerable English. The Scriptures, too, were embraced in the circle of their studies; and though the errors of their church were never pointed out, they were not

slow to detect them. The practice of praying for the dead was early brought forward by Moses, in an inquiry respecting its lawfulness. Mr. Dittrich chose to reply by merely pointing out some passages in the Bible, opposed to it. The deacon needed no more; he was already prepared to reject it. He soon, indeed, began to give pleasing evidence of a change of heart. His companion had not advanced so far; and for some time opposed, not forbearing to apply to him the epithet of heretic. He, too, at length became convinced; but the signs of his conversion, though such as to give encouraging hope, were never, owing perhaps to his natural temperament being of a more intellectual make, so distinctly marked. Not having been converted in the school of controversy, both were more inclined, in conversing with their countrymen, to urge the great *duties* of repentance and faith, than to wrangle about points of speculative *doctrine*, however important. Thus their usefulness was great, and their enemies few. In fact, so mild and inoffensive was their deportment, that whatever they said was listened to, and such efficient coadjutors did they bid fair to become, that the missionaries contemplated sending them to some European seminary, for a more complete education than could be obtained at Shoosha. They never forsook the Armenian church, nor did they ever commune with the church of the mission.

“The experiment which these brethren have made is exceedingly important. Let us gather some of the fruits of their experience. They have been led to doubt whether their original design of enlightening the Armenian nation, without drawing away any from the Armenian communion, can be carried into complete execution. As the people become enlightened, they will of course wish for spiritual food, and for a rational and evangelical mode of worship; both of which must be sought elsewhere than in their own church. Some, also, will be the victims of persecution and excommunication. A mission church cannot refuse to open its arms to such as are thus excluded, by conscience, or by opposition, from their own. Still, so many barriers are set up by prejudice against foreign influence, that neither foreign missionaries alone, nor converts who have united with them, and thus come to be viewed as foreigners and apostates, can hardly expect to effect the entire reformation of the Armenian church. The work must be done by enlightened persons rising up from the midst of the church itself; and the greater the amount of light that is diffused through the nation before it is attempted, the more sure and complete will be the result.

“The missionary, therefore, instead of aiming to make proselytes to his own communion, although he may receive individuals who wish or are forced to come, should shape his measures so as to draw as few as possible. To this end he should avoid unnecessary controversy. By it, ceremonial and unessential points are magnified into essentials in the estimation of the convert, and his conscience made so sensitive, as to force him speedily from the communion of his church; while the clergy, at the same time, are irritated, and urged to search out and persecute or excommunicate all who are inclined to heresy. On general principles, too, it is inexpedient. For, instead of conveying important truth to the mind, it awakens prejudice to

shut the door by immediate opposition, while by a contrary course, the seed might be widely scattered and become deeply rooted before the occurrence of such an event. The brethren confess, too, that stated and formal preaching to a regular congregation, although, did the laws of the country allow, their feelings would strongly urge them to attempt it as the most effectual mode of religious instruction, tends more than almost any thing to bring opposition upon inquirers for the truth, and to draw a line of separation between them and their church.

"You will expect us to suggest, in some part of our journey, what American Christians can do toward diffusing evangelical light in Russian Armenia. Our suggestions can be given nowhere more advantageously than here, in the light of the experiment of the Shoosha mission. In order to accomplish so desirable an object, no attempt, of course, should be made to transgress the laws of the land. Principles of expediency, of our society, and of religion, equally forbid it. And yet, it must be confessed, the door of entrance, if we would infringe upon none of them, is exceedingly strait. That an additional *printing press* could not be advantageously established, you hardly need that we should intimate, after what has been said of the press at Shoosha. So many difficulties would there be, also, in the way of sending *missionaries*, that we would not take upon ourselves at present to recommend it. Still, we are far from being ready to abandon, as inaccessible, so large a portion of the Armenian nation, (embracing now the emigrant population of Persian Armenia, and of the northern part of Turkish Armenia,) as is assembled in the trans-Caucasian provinces of Russia. The door of entrance, though strait, is not entirely closed. Government has still left, and in a measure guaranteed to the German missionaries, a very important sphere of usefulness, in allowing them such scope in the establishment and direction of *schools*. And we attribute to it the more importance, from a firm persuasion, that the emperor looks upon their operations with pleasure, and that his inclinations would lead him to increase rather than diminish their privileges. Still, through want of funds, they are unable to cultivate the field that is thus open to them. Before our visit, their society, on account of the smallness of its income, had directed them by no means to enlarge their system of gratuitous instruction, which is the very thing that is needed in the present intellectual condition of the people. And the letter which communicated to us the decision of the emperor, said, 'We fear our society is not able to carry into effect what is most needed—schools and printing.' We would therefore strongly recommend to you to consider, if it be not expedient to extend to them a helping hand, by furnishing them with the means, in money and books, of putting into operation the extensive system of schools that is called for. You cannot need a word to convince you of the extreme desirableness, that so important a field, so providentially opened, should be immediately occupied. Of the gentlemen whom you would thus make your agents, we happen, owing to changes that have occurred since we were there, to be acquainted with only one who is ordained. Respecting him, it gives us pleasure to testify that we have no expectation of your being able to send out from our own country a man of higher qualifications for judgment, learning and piety."

We have no doubt but these specimens will whet the Christian reader's appetite for more; and even on the subjects most interesting to him, we feel we have afforded a very inadequate idea of the work: while if even general readers, on our testimony, would peruse it, they would find much regarding the external aspect and natural and artificial productions of these almost unknown regions; the moral and political state of the people; their customs and mode of living, which in vain he will look for elsewhere. To the student of ecclesiastical history, the account of the Chaldaean Nestorians will be very valuable. But we must close with two notices: the one interesting to every one to whom the name of Martyn is known and dear; the other, alike honorable to Britons and to our American friends, who record it with evident delight:—

“ While at Tokát, we had the melancholy pleasure of visiting the tomb of the Rev. Henry Martyn, who died at this place in the year 1812, when on his way from Persia to England. His remains lie buried in the extensive cemetery of the Armenian church of Karasoon Manoog, and are covered by a monument, erected by Claudius James Rich, Esq. late English resident at Bagdad. An appropriate Latin inscription is all that distinguishes his tomb from the tombs of the Armenians who sleep by his side.”

“ At Azáb some reluctance was manifested to entertaining us, but our muleteers soon procured us admission to a house. On entering, we asked the owner if he could lodge us, and were answered coolly that the *bin-bashy* (colonel) knew. Then, looking at us, and listening to our conversation with each other a moment, he declared that we were not Russians; and it appeared that our men had endeavoured to obtain for us a forced hospitality by announcing us as officers of the army. We informed him that our language was English, and his countenance immediately brightened; the house was at our disposal, and whatever we wished was cheerfully brought. No nation bears so good a character in Armenia as the English. A high idea is entertained of their neatness, rank, and liberality; and the stranger can receive no higher compliment, in the estimation of his host, than to be called a real Englishman. It ought, however, to be added, that hardly any other nation is personally known, except the Russians.”

THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM.*

OUR readers will not, we trust, have forgotten our notice of the first part of Mr. Maitland's pamphlet, in the October number of the EXAMINER. We purpose now to continue our review of the remaining numbers, and we have adjoined thereto a curious little book, just published, which will furnish us with some remarkable illustrations of Mr. Maitland's positions. That the author is a Dissenter, he declares in his preface, and we do not pretend to wisdom "beyond what is written;"—at any rate, it is a very amusing and interesting volume, abounding in facts, tinctured with humour, and occasionally, perhaps, bordering on caricature. He traces his course with great candour, from the commencement of his studies for the ministry, through all its various changes and chances, until worn out with hard labour, and discarded because worn out, we find him settled as pastor of a small village chapel. Secured from further descent in the scale of ministerial appointments, by being much in the situation described in John Bunyan's doggerel,

"He that is down need fear no fall."

In the first part of the "Voluntary System," the author, after rebutting several charges against the Established Church, by showing parallel or greater evils existing among "the interest," proceeds to inquire more particularly as to the probable future working of this dissenting system (supposing it to be substituted for the present church,) from past experience of its efficacy or inefficacy. This, it must be admitted at once, is both philosophical and just, and the inquiry is a very serious one—one that requires accuracy, truth, and impartiality. Our author, deficient in no requisite quality, and intact in character, might have proceeded to state on his own authority, and from his own knowledge, the facts upon which our opinion must be based. He might have brought forward his own views of its operation, and have relied upon the inductions of his own judgment, finding an echo in the experience of his candid readers. This plan, we say, he might have adopted and have come off victorious. But if the triumph of his cause were thus secure of achievement, how much is the value and extent of his conquest increased by the mode he *has* adopted; he advances little of his own, save to render his collected evidence intelligible and forcible; he has taken authorities admitted by Dissenters themselves—books and persons, held in reverence among them—we had almost said, the

* The Voluntary System. By a Churchman. Parts II. and III. 12mo. London, 1834. The Autobiography of a Dissenting Minister. 12mo. London, 1834.

canons and canonized of their party—are made to bear evidence against their own system, and the triumphal shouts of many a Goliath among them, are made to contrast strangely with their previous wailings. If we were surprised at some disclosures in Mr. M.'s first part, our astonishment is doubled now, with no small share of indignation, at the men who ought, who must know, how signally their plans have failed to answer the desired end, coming unblushingly forward to recommend a system like this to universal adoption. But we thank them, they have brought matters to a crisis—there can be now no compromise—high-sounding words and rounded periods will now do only for tea parties. We—the public and the accredited organs of public opinion—must have facts; ay, and stubborn ones too, to rebut such a work as Mr. Maitland's. It will not do to tell us of America; let them show now, at once, in an open, honest manner, that at home the system has answered in the limited extent in which the trial has been made, before they ask us to give it a wider field. Verily, a general who cannot conquer a province is unfit to combat for a kingdom. We wish not to attack individuals. We war not with persons, but with opinions. We impugn not the representatives of dissent, but the system of dissent itself.

Before we enter on the question of "how has it worked?" there is, as our author remarks—

"A previous question to be noticed—'How should it work?' Or, in other words—what are we looking for, and what do we expect? Do we look for a system that shall turn off its work with the precision and perfection of a machine, and do, without fault or failure, all that it was intended to do? Are we really dreaming about a perfect system, made up of, and worked by, and working upon imperfect beings? Nobody is so absurd as to cherish such an expectation; and yet it too frequently happens that, seeing much more clearly the mote in our brother's eye, than the beam in our own, we reason as if the faults of a system must form a sufficient reason for abandoning it, instead of calmly inquiring whether we can adopt any other system whose faults are less and fewer. This has been the fault of some Dissenters. They have fixed their eyes on every defect in the theory and practice of the Established Church, while they seem to have forgotten that their own system had any thing which could be amended. Like carrion flies they eagerly fastened and fed on every sore spot—they chuckled and clamoured, and exaggerated and declaimed, till, if they did not persuade themselves (though this has, I really believe, sometimes and in some degree happened) they made their ignorant hearers believe that the voluntary system was the only possible form of a true Christian church, and that the Church of England was essentially anti-christian—that the clergyman and the dissenting minister were the very antipodes of each other—that the one was a wolf, concealing his rapacity, and cruel hatred of all real godliness, under sheep's clothing, while the other was a poor, persecuted lamb, enduring all things with heavenly love and patience—the one lusting only

after tithes ; the other wholly regardless of salary—the one always playing at cards when he was not feasting and dancing ; the other always praying when he was not teaching or preaching—the one scarcely able, when he was sober, to mumble out a printed sermon, even supposing he had not taken a play-book into the pulpit by mistake ; the other extemporizing like an angel, and dividing the word of truth with unlimited skill and masterly precision."

This was all very amusing, doubtless, and certainly very harmless, until these assertions were mistaken for arguments, and upon such grounds it was proposed to knock down the church, and build up a voluntary system in its place. It now becomes necessary to investigate a little, and our way will be cleared by the answer to the previous question—"How should it work?" To quote again from Mr. M. :—

"The best ecclesiastical system is that which most effectually, and in the greatest degree, secures these three objects :

"1. To provide a sufficient number of fit ministers, and to exclude unfit persons from the work of the ministry.

"2. To provide for the proper maintenance of ministers, and for the erection and maintenance of suitable places of worship.

"3. To regulate the connexion between the ministers and the people, and between the people themselves, as members of the church, in such a way as shall best promote mutual respect, and brotherly love, peace, order, discipline, and thereby the increase of true religion."

The author very ably shows that the voluntary system has not, as yet, provided an adequate number of ministers of *any kind* ; and passing to the question of fitness, with respect especially to moral character, he considerably offers to waive his proofs, unless he should be driven to this most painful exposure. It may, however, interest our readers to know something of their intellectual capabilities, and, therefore, we shall make our *autobiographer* relate how he fared during his education. No wonder they wish to get into our universities ! Our readers must be told that some of the dissenting colleges are considered 'crack' ones, as to classical learning, and in order to obtain admission into them a previous examination and a certificate of the same is necessary. This examination may be undertaken by the minister at whose chapel the candidate attends. In the present instance it was so, and we have a humorous account of our hero's trepidation, which was only lessened by discovering that the parson was equally afraid of being caught :—

"I trembled a little," says he, "but not so much as I should have done, had I not seen Smart's Horace and Duncan's Virgil on the table in the next room."

The minister having stated the requisite qualification to be the construing of Horace, fetched, not Smart's, but the Delphin edition, and presenting it to the candidate, said, "Read where you

please." This was lucky, as our hero only knew the first ode, a part of which he read, and his examiner graciously and kindly interrupted him, saying,

" ' That will do, sir, perfectly well! admirably well! You not only construe Horace, but you enter into the spirit of your author. I shall have great pleasure in making a favourable report of your scholarship.' Then, after a moment's silence, and with a little hesitation, the gentleman proceeded—' Pray, sir, at your school did you learn the metres?' To which he (the autobiographer) answered fearlessly, 'Mr. — did not think metres of much use.' "

This reply was manifestly a great relief to the examiner, who replied with great alacrity—

" ' I am quite of his opinion; and, I believe, at the college where you are going the same opinions are entertained. Some pedantic individuals have occasionally endeavoured to introduce into our seminaries of learning an attention to these trifles, but good sound sense has got the better of these pedants.' 'Indeed, sir, what can we know of the Latin quantity? We know not how the Romans pronounced their prose, and we are much less likely to know how they pronounced their poetry.' "!!!

This is inimitable; and his description of the college course is equally satisfactory:—

" The full course of instruction extended through a period of five years, though it frequently happened that students departed before the completion of that period, in consequence of a call to some pastoral office, for during the last two years of our residence we used to preach here and there, as occasion offered: so that if a vacant congregation happened to take a fancy to a young gentleman *in statu pupillari*, he was very easily persuaded to sacrifice the last year of his academic course, for the sake of an immediate introduction to the pastoral office. The routine of instruction was not laid down with any great precision, but as far as I can recollect, it was something to the following effect:—The instruction which we received from our divinity tutor was, for the first year, logic and metaphysics; for the second year, metaphysics and scripture history; for the third year, divinity in general, including controversial theology; and for the fourth and fifth years, the same. Several other matters also were attended to by this tutor, such as the composition of themes and sermons, together with elocution. By the above statement, very little information is communicated to the reader; therefore it may be necessary to describe more minutely the manner in which the instruction was conveyed. The divinity tutor instructed us by lectures, and I must acknowledge that the word lecture sounded to my ears so much more manly than the word lesson, that it had an indescribable charm for me at my first entrance into the college; and when I came to ascertain what a lecture really was, it became much more charming, for it required on my part no trouble at all!

" This was his mode of lecturing: from a book of his own writing, or of some one else's, for I could merely see that it was a written book, he read

to us as we sat at a table, with writing materials about us, a certain quantity of matter concerning logic, metaphysics or divinity, as the case might be, and we, listening with much apparent reverence and attention to the lecturer, endeavoured, according to the best of our ability or inclination, to take down what was said, in order that we might afterwards profit thereby. But, alas! such was the frailty of our nature, and the digressiveness of our minds, that we retained either in our minds or in our note-books, but little of the instruction thus communicated to us. I used to think that it would have been better for us at once to have had the manuscript given to us, so that we might have transcribed it fairly and deliberately; but then that would not have been lecturing. It may, however, be asked, whether there were not some subsequent examination whereby our progress might be ascertained. In answer to this very natural inquiry, I can only say, that there certainly was an annual examination; but I am very sure that it was impossible for any one, by means of that examination, to ascertain our progress in those subjects in which we were examined. I desire to have it understood, that I am now speaking of matters which took place many years ago, and, therefore, there may have been, in recent times, some alteration in the mode of examination at this learned college. But in those days this was the form and mode of the examination. Previously to the long summer vacation we began our preparations. Let it be supposed that a class consisted of four persons; the divinity tutor would give to each of them in turn, a question relative to the matters in which they had been lectured; these questions were written down by the students, and they endeavoured as well as they could, from the notes which they had taken of the lectures, to find the answers to the questions; but if the notes happened unfortunately to be deficient just where they were most wanted, then the tutor would supply the deficiency from his own book, in which all the questions and answers were written down at length; or if the language of the reply, which the student might furnish from his own resources, should not be exactly the same with that in the tutor's lecture-book, then would he kindly set the student right, and make the two answers coincide, word for word, in order to prevent mistakes at the time of examination. If, then, the number of questions should amount to one hundred and twenty, it was not expected or even demanded of each student to answer all the questions, but each student took the question only which came to his turn, and if the whole set were divided into four equal parts, then, of a class of four, each individual would have only thirty answers to learn by heart, and those thirty answers were learned during the long summer vacation. The examination, which was immediately after the long vacation, took place in the presence of the directors or trustees, and no one else, and the tutors themselves were the examiners; and the examination on the part of the divinity tutor, consisted in his having us say by rote those cut-and-dried answers which had been prepared for us previous to the vacation. The trustees, being elderly and quiet gentlemen, bore the examination with most exemplary patience, and very wisely abstained from asking us any questions, for fear, perhaps, of putting us out. I cannot but confess that, when I found what was the

system of instruction and the mode of examination, I began to wonder what must be the line of tuition pursued in the less learned seminaries. I will not affirm that the lectures given might not have been very good, and all the matters therein stated very true; yet there was no effectual provision made to bring us to a right understanding of them; and in our examination, provided our memories were equally good, it was impossible for any one to ascertain which of us understood the topics and which did not.

"Our classical and mathematical studies were not a whit superior to our metaphysical and theological. Whence our college gained its reputation for classical pre-eminence I know not, and cannot conjecture. It is very true that we talked about, and pretended to read the higher authors, but we read them in such a fashion, that it would have been next to a miracle if we could have recollected on Saturday what we learned on Wednesday. We read Sophocles, we read Plato, we read Longinus, we read Aristotle, but we knew no more of those authors after we had read them than we did before; for we merely made an attempt to construe the text by the help of the Latin version at the bottom of the page. I also found Smart's Horace and Duncan's Virgil quite as great favourites at this seat of learning, as they had been at the classical and commercial seminary, where I had received the earlier part of my education. Prosody also was by no means popular in this institution. The Greek metres were never once named; for surely if it were a waste of time to study the Latin metres, it must have been a still greater waste to study the Greek. I have since ascertained what I then suspected, that the managers of the institution, by way of economizing their resources, hired the cheapest classical tutors that they could get; for they knew that there was an English translation of every Latin author, and a Latin version of every Greek book, and they took it for granted that some way or other the English of both might be acquired; and, in truth, the whole of our classical discipline was doing the text into English. I have in the course of my life frequently regretted the slovenly manner in which, at that seat of learning, we pretended to read the classics, but at the time I was highly gratified to find how soon and how easily I could read Sophocles, Plato, and Longinus."

This extract will be enough to show the spirit of the college course; the other studies were equally "voluntary," and, therefore, equally superficial. These statements are amply borne out in essentials, by the quotations in Mr. Maitland's pamphlet.

Upon the alleged illiberality of not admitting dissenters, *as such*, into our colleges, Mr. Maitland very appositely remarks:

"Why, into which of their colleges would they admit a churchman? Suppose a youth were to apply for admission at Homerton, and tell Dr. Smith that he was a member of the Church of England, and wished to be admitted a student to prepare himself for orders in that church; would he not be told, that he could not be received unless he was not only professedly a dissenter, but an actual member of a dissenting church? Nay, sir, I

verily believe, that if he were not a churchman—if he were only a Socinian,* who might afterwards preach turn about with the tutor, in the Orphan School Chapel, they would not receive him. And yet, at the ‘great meeting of the dissenters,’ a few days ago, (as reported by the *Christian Advocate*,) Mr. James, of Birmingham, had the modesty to say, ‘He was himself lately at Oxford, and was it no insult or oppression to see, in imagination, over the door of every college—Off, off, ye profane! no dissenters can be admitted here?’ Really, sir, if Mr. James had not assured us of the fact, I should have doubted whether ‘he was himself’ when he made so gross a blunder. I hope he will go again, and with clear sight and sunshine, I am sure he will see that the inscription, which he has misunderstood, is, ‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house!’”

We shall not lengthen this paper by a quotation from Mr. M. touching the education of dissenters; we have already had a specimen of the course pursued in one of their ‘crack’ academies. As to their capabilities when educated, he has brought forward numerous proofs, from Mr. Wilson’s (a dissenter) work on “The History and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches and Meeting Houses in London, *including the Lives of their Ministers*,” &c. &c. to show that even the higher orders among them are not always what they would have us suppose; indeed a curious species of information on this question is afforded by Mr. W.’s mode of praising certain ministers, which he does by contrasting their good qualities with some very queer ones, of which, by implication, he accuses others. Take an instance; speaking of one minister, he says:

“He was not one of those ministers who love punning in the pulpit—who cannot forego a joke even at the expense of decency and good manners, though by these means too many gain the admiration of a gaping multitude, yet they were acts that he abhorred.” And again, “He affected no unusual tones, or indecent gestures.”

So much for this indirect accusation. Let us hear a few of his direct censures:

“He is said to have possessed but slender talents, and to have affected too much of the fop.”

“His talents, as a pulpit orator, however, did not gain him popularity, and his sentiments are said to have given disgust to his hearers.”

“He was an illiterate man, and did not continue here long.”

“His method of preaching is said to have been somewhat tiresome. There is a story told of him, but for the truth of which we cannot be

* To justify this severity it is only necessary to state, that whilst Socinians are admitted to the meetings in Red-cross-street, on the terms of Christian fellowship, the society has actually excluded some orthodox dissenting ministers, *merely* because, in the independent exercise of their judgments, they ventured to use the *Church Liturgy*!!

responsible, that in one part of his life, he was employed no less than four months in developing the mysteries of Joseph's coat, from Gen. xxxvii. 3. 'And he made him a coat of many colours.'"

Many more extracts could be adduced to show that inefficient ministers *may* get into the "interest," nay, that, perhaps, they *are* as frequent as in the church; but for these we refer our readers to the pamphlet before us. That they, too, write (that is, the *best* preachers) their *extempore* sermons (if not prayers) beforehand, and even sometimes buy them either in M. S. of the aforesaid Mr. Wallis, or in print, under the denomination of *skeleton sermons*, is also confessed. And now let us pass on to the consideration of the provision made for the support of ministers; of course, it is ample, independent and secure, under this "world-redeeming" system. Let us hear Mr. James himself:—

"They treat him (i. e. the parson) as they would wild beasts, which are tamed into submission by hunger, and keep him humble by keeping him poor. It is curious to hear how some persons will intreat of God to bless their minister in his basket, and in his store, while, alas! poor man, *they have taken care* that his basket should be empty, and his store nothingness itself."

This follows, of course, from the system of voluntary support—by keeping the minister rather short, he becomes their tool—in order to escape starvation he becomes servile and truckling to the leading men, knowing, as he does, that they can either turn him out, or starve him out. Obstinacy and perseverance are useless here; they have the power, and they will keep it. Our autobiographer relates a case of a minister who wished to remain in spite of his unpopularity, and the trustees or managers took off the roof of the chapel, that he might be either drenched out or blown out. This is wretched enough when the obnoxious person is young and able to breast a storm, with capability of earning a living in some other part; but what shall we say when we find the subjects of such treatment to be men, whose lives have been spent in the laborious exercise of their pastoral duties; surely all well-governed states, communities or societies, should provide for the old age of their servants.

"Some of my readers," says the autobiographer, "may inquire, what then becomes of those poor old ministers, who have outlived the popularity and attractiveness of their younger days. They do not, indeed, have recourse to the parish, but I fear that some of them suffer great privations. I once knew a meek and timid man, not past the middle of life, but sadly deficient in that kind of energy which renders a minister attractive in the pulpit, who was requested to withdraw from his situation, to make way for a more popular and attractive preacher; the request nearly broke his heart, but he did not dare refuse, so he gave up his income of about one hundred a-year, and was glad to accept an offer of twenty pounds a-year from a small village congregation, and by the help, I believe, of a small school, he did at that time manage to keep himself off the parish.

"There are, amongst the several denominations of dissenters, charitable funds raised for the relief of poor ministers, and certainly amongst the people are many kindly-disposed individuals, who, however, can never control the evils of a system radically bad. These charitable funds are raised by congregational collections, and when charity sermons are preached for that purpose, the preacher of course tries all he can to awake the sympathies of his audience, and to excite their compassion; for this purpose, he will sometimes read letters from the poor ministers themselves, descriptive of their sufferings and privations. I have heard many of these letters, and they have excited a very painful feeling in my mind. Sometimes an applicant for relief states that he has a salary of only £30 a year; that he keeps a little school, which just serves to pay his rent; that he has a wife and seven or eight children, the eldest not more than twelve years of age, and he speaks with an affectionate commendation of his wife's industry, who, in order to assist the family, just to keep decently alive, employs herself in millinery or straw-bonnet making. Then he prays for the usual annual donation of five pounds, which may serve, so the letter says, to purchase bread and potatoes for the winter.—This is literally true."

We have said enough about the poverty of ministers supported by the voluntary system. It is a very painful subject, and nothing but the audacious exaltation of such a system ought, or could have called forth the exposure. 'Tis true, poverty is met with among the officials of the church, perhaps in an equal degree; but it will be recollected that the voluntary system is said to be free from this and other stains which disfigure our establishment. The next point to be noticed is the ample provision of places of worship among the Dissenters. That an attempt has been made to supply the wants of the people, in this respect, is granted; but let us inquire in what state these buildings are, as property. Some of them certainly are paid for, but a great number are deeply in debt, and this debt cripples the exertions of the congregation in favour of their minister, and effectually prevents a great extension of their system. But, supposing there were no other means of multiplying places of worship, it will easily be seen in what a lamentable condition, as to light and information, our country must remain. But we will let Mr. Maitland speak for himself:

"We will suppose," says he, "that the time has arrived when the congregation has outgrown the cottage room, and is resolved on building. It is true they have no adequate funds, but this is seldom a hindrance. We will suppose them, however, to go to work prudently, and on a very moderate scale, and that the estimate for the chapel amounts to £450. Whoever looks at the newly-formed village congregation, must acknowledge that they will do very handsomely, and show zeal and liberality, if they collect among themselves as much as £50. Yet, that I may avoid the appearance of exaggeration, (though to every one acquainted with the subject, it will be clear that I do, in fact, exaggerate the other way,) I will suppose that they raise £100 among themselves, and get £50 more among neighbouring

congregations. I will suppose, too, (what is also rather improbable,) that the actual expense exceeds the estimate by only £100; and then, when the chapel is opened, 'the debt upon it' (almost an integral part of the building) will be £400, and interest on this, at five per cent, will form a sort of anti-endowment of £20 per annum. Now, how, you will ask, are these poor people to raise the £400, besides the now annual expense of keeping up the place and paying the minister?"

How? why an appeal is made to "the interest," and the minister sent on a begging expedition, exposed to all the doubts, suspicions, and rebuffs, consequent on his new vocation. To use the graphic language of the autobiographer,

"As every penny was to be paid for out of the monies collected by me, an intimation was given to me that I must travel as economically as possible. I was never to travel inside the stage coach; and, whenever I could, I was to walk from town to town, sending my luggage by a carrier. I was to avoid inns, and to refuse no invitations to dinner, tea, or supper, when they came in my way: and if I was, at any time, under an absolute necessity of being at an inn, I was to contrive to make supper serve for dinner, together with divers other economical suggestions.

"After an absence of six weeks, I returned home, having collected seventy four pounds six shillings, from which I had deducted only six pounds six shillings for my own travelling expenses. I expected to receive great applause for my economy, instead of which I was rather blamed, that I had not kept a more exact account of the manner in which I had spent the money."

But, suppose this said chapel should have been built in consequence of a schism in a large congregation, and as a kind of rival to another, and suppose the said division to be healed, either by the death of the offending minister, or by his making the *amende honorable*, and suppose the schismatic members to return to their allegiance—leaving the more recent minister "a nice new chapel half paid for, and full of nothing but empty pews." Supposing all this, we say, what is to be done? The person who has lent the money to build the chapel cannot be expected to rest satisfied without either principal or interest, and there is nothing left but to advertize through Mr. Wallis, &c. and sell the building, so long devoted to God's service, for a chapel, or *for any thing else*, and turn the poor pastor adrift.

Many instances of chapels in debt are given by Mr. Maitland, enough to satisfy the most incredulous, and we only regret that the last part (Part IV.) of his work has not yet arrived in this country. The point which now remains for his discussion, is the footing on which the minister stands with his congregation, &c. We shall, therefore, close our review with a humorous extract on this subject from the autobiographer, and, in so doing, we beg strongly to recommend both it and Mr. Maitland's little work to the notice of our readers.

A waggish dissenting minister wrote a treatise called *Directions for Dissenting Ministers*, in the style of Dean Swift's *Directions to Servants*. From the chapter entitled, "How to Gain the Good-will of a Dissenting Congregation," our autobiographer says,

"I do not pretend to quote the words, but I remember the substance very well. He begins by saying that a dissenting minister ought to consider himself as placed over a congregation, in order to afford them pleasant amusement on Sundays, and to make the gospel so entertaining, that the people may not fall asleep under the preaching of it. For this purpose he must never contradict any of their opinions, nor oppose any of their humours or caprices, for nobody likes opposition or contradiction. Then he goes on to say, that it is, for this purpose, of the greatest moment, that the minister should know what are the opinions of the influential or subscribing part of his congregation on the doctrines of the gospel, and if he finds them tolerably unanimous on the subject, he cannot do better than preach often on those topics, and use all his ingenuity to prove those points which nobody denies. He says, that he has often observed, that his own congregation never looked in such decided good humour, as when he was proving, by irrefragable arguments, all that they assented to without proof; for it is so easy, he adds, to find arguments to convince those who believe, and, on the other hand, it is so difficult to find arguments to convince those who do not. Then, he says, that people are never tired of hearing arguments which convince them, and that people never like to be convinced of what they don't believe. I am sure in that he is very right. I know it by my own experience. Arguing *a priori*, as the saying is, one might suppose that the great use of argument is to bring conviction; no such thing, but the great use of argument is to please those who are convinced. Again, The safest way of all, is not to preach against any sins of which any of your congregation may be guilty; but if you have sufficient ingenuity to preach against sin, without disturbing the sinner, it is so much the better, for you thereby get the reputation of being a faithful preacher. For a faithful preacher, says he, is one who preaches in favour of my opinions, and against every one's sins but mine."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Management of Bees, with a Description of the Ladies' Safety Hive. By Samuel Bagster, Jun. Illustrated with 40 wood engravings. London: Samuel Bagster, Jun. Paternoster-row, 1834.

Spiritual Honey from Natural Hives; or Meditations and Observations on the Natural History of Bees. By Samuel Purchas, first introduced to public notice in 1637. London: Samuel Bagster, 1834.

These works prove to us that Mr. Samuel Bagster, Junior, is a working bee, and no drone; and that, while in Paternoster-row, he is making bee-bread for the LARVÆ of little Bagster-bees. He has at some convenient place, within the sound of Bow-bells, set up an apiary, where he disports himself, and rides his hobby with great vivacity. Thus Mr. Samuel Bagster, while he waxes rich in the Row, waxes happy amongst his hives; writes under the inspiration of mantling metheglin; and shows himself off a bookseller and bee-fancier, as both merry and wise. We, reviewers, who are more in the way of stinging than being stung, confess great ignorance in apiarian researches; and we would, perhaps, have remained in contented oblivion, had we not been presented with these pretty volumes. But now there is much danger of these presentations proving all too dear; for, verily, we are much tempted to commence bee-masters ourselves; and we do say within ourselves, Why should not a CHRISTIAN EXAMINER be hobbyhorsical? Why not caper and curvett away like Master Samuel Bagster, junior? Why not enjoy our home, and take to spiritualizing honey, and distil our *aqua vitæ*, our sweet spirits of mead, as well as Master Samuel Purchas, senior? Moreover, our bias receives additional side-weight by the consideration, that Mister Bagster has assured us that the stupefying process does now as well as the bee-murdering process by

brimstone of former times; for, to say the truth, we never could exactly comprehend why old Walton's work should be valued, or the sport he loved should be counted innocent, gentle, and perhaps Christian, when the more stirring sports of hunting and shooting were placed under ban, as ferocious and heathenish. In corporal sufferance, we counted that the worm and the trout, ay, and the minnow, felt a pang as great as when a woodcock or a fox died; and we did, and do still, deem that a man, a CLERGYMAN, is as great a waster of the precious time allotted him under the sun, when he hangs over a brook in piscatory devotedness, as when he gives the reins to his horse, and careers in hot excitement, in order to see a hare die. The truth is, the whole creation groans under the cruelty of man; and it little matters whether his reckless ferocity is exercised in impaling a worm on a bit of crooked iron, in order to put another species of animal to death by an equally slow and exquisite torture; or whether he make the timid hare break her heart, or the gentle doe drop tears of agony as she dies—it is all one—the same abuse of the creatures of God; and all we want is, that such as Mr. Walton will not insult common sense by his mawkish and discriminating sensibilities. We therefore rejoice to find that, according to the approved methods that Mr. Bagster has pointed out, we can take honey out of a bee's store, without stifling its industrious collectors; therefore it is that as, without cruelty, we can now investigate with pleasure and profit the habits of the most industrious insect in existence, we have a fancy to become bee-masters, and try experiments on honey,

bee-bread, propolis, and royal jelly, and take a frequent peep into the procreative and mathematical processes of queens, drones, and workers. But, alas! sober realities pull us by the ear, and caution us that it is not for reviewers, but for book-sellers—not for editors, but proprietors—not for authors, but publishers, that such HOBBYHORSE-LITIES are reserved. A gentleman of the trade may well sing,

"My banks they are furnished with bees,"

because his bank is well furnished with cash. But not so authors, contributors, and reviewers: they are the working bees, and their employers as queens, while sucking the honey-combs, may sing,

"Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes."

To be serious (for such must be a CHRISTIAN EXAMINER's tone, though for a season he lapses into fun)—Mr. Bagster's treatise on the Management of Bees is very amusing and instructive; and to those who are entomologists, or bee-fanciers, it will prove of much value; for, dressed in an odd but lively costume, it conveys, we believe, all that is worth knowing concerning the natural history and economical management of bees. We have often wished that our Irish clergymen would, like Pastor Oberlin, make themselves acquainted with the details of rural economy, and the best modes of increasing the comforts and enlarging the industrious habits of the poor, in order to lead their flocks, as he did, by precept and example, to better their condition. We are quite sure that, as in the case of Oberlin, the ONE THING NEEDFUL may be rather advantaged and more enforced by well-timed instructions as to temporal concerns. In this respect we deem the Irish clergy much deficient; and we would hint, even if it were the last line that ever was written by the Editor of the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, that HE has indeed but a narrow mind and a con-

tracted view of pastoral usefulness, who cannot bestow his thoughts and his exertions for a season in the improvement of the temporal condition of his flock, without a feeling that he is derelict in his more important duty as a watcher over their souls.

The second treatise, namely, the "Spiritual Honey from Natural Hives," by Samuel Purchas, is a good specimen of the puritan quaintness that characterised the period of the Commonwealth. Sometimes terribly forcibly—seldom simple or pleasing—often overstrained and absurd—always serious and pious. The specimen before us may be valued by those who love to taste of such ancient and highly-seasoned condiments; but we think Mr. Bagster wise in his generation in publishing the two works separately; for, if we are not much mistaken, many will call for Mr. Bagster's Honey book, who will not trouble themselves with the bee-bread of old Samuel Purchas.

Meditations, or Remains of L. S. 12mo. London, 1834.

A most unpretending, but very valuable little volume, the production of a fair and gentle spirit, now inhabiting the abodes of the blessed. The preface is by Charlotte Elizabeth, who there gives an account of the circumstances under which it was written. Few and evil, as regards the body, were the days of L. S. Scarcely had she entered on life's stage, ere she was attacked by disease, which confined her to the sofa for a long period: the stroke under which her frame yielded mercifully spared her mind; and her ministrations to the poor around her continued in spirit, and by the hands of others. The pages now before us bear witness to the activity and spirituality of the inward operations of her soul. They are characterised throughout by a sweet feminine tone of feeling, and more

profundity than would be expected from the author's years. Under the influence of the Spirit of God, she grew in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ; and as her outward tabernacle decayed, the flame within burned brighter and brighter, until it was lost to earthly view, by mingling with the light and glory of heaven.

We have been greatly pleased with this little book; and we strongly recommend it to our Christian readers, and to the younger of the female sex especially. As a specimen, we shall give an extract, taken indifferently from the body of the work:—

“Prayer cannot properly be called an *act* of the mind—it is a *habit* expressed by an act. Prayer includes all the finest, softest, and loftiest emotions of the human heart—the highest exertions of the intellectual powers. It expresses belief in an invisible, almighty, wise, and benevolent God—faith in a Redeemer—reliance on a Sanctifier; it supposes the mystery of a Trinity in unity. It expresses dependance on God, assurance of his mercy through Christ, devotedness and submission, love, reverence, fear, gratitude, admiration; it declares a sense of infirmity—a consciousness of sin. It is the expression, in one word, of faith, hope, and charity; and without these subsisting in the heart, the prayer of the lips is vain; it then becomes a mere ceremonial observance, and, as such, cannot be agreeable to God, who is a Spirit.”

Lives of Eminent Zoologists, from Aristotle to Linneus. By W. Macgillivray, A.M. Being Vol. XVI. of the Edinburgh Cabinet Library. 12mo. 1834.

We are very happy to find this useful series of publications flourishing still. If we may take those which have appeared, and especially the present number, as specimens of those yet to come, we may anticipate a wider celebrity than it, as yet, has attained. Mr. M.'s work does him great credit, and will be perused with intense

interest, especially by the young. It is delightful to trace the progress of a science, and even more so, the private life of the individuals by whose labour it has attained its present advancement. This volume contains the lives of Aristotle, Pliny, Redi, Gordat, Aldeovandi, Ray, Reamam, Linnæus, &c.; all that is known concerning them has, with great industry, been collected, and is placed before the reader in a very pleasing form. We cannot enter into particulars, but strongly recommend our friends to read the book for themselves. It is got up very neatly, and the price is so moderate as to place it within the reach of all.

The Biblical Keepsake: or, Landscape Illustrations of the most remarkable places mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, arranged in the order of the several books and chapters, made from Original Sketches taken on the spot, and engraved by W. and E. Finden. With Descriptions of the Plates by the Rev. Thomas Hartwell Horne, B.D., &c. &c. London: Murray.

The “Annuals,” as they are termed, do not fall within the sphere of “Notices,” from the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER. They are too ephemeral; and, though not irreligious, yet, with an exception or two, not religious; nor even on the score of literature can we recommend them. They are flimsy; superficial; and have been among the means of deteriorating public taste, and creating a morbid appetite for reading, and banishing the love for what is solid, instructive, and improving to taste, sentiment, and morals.

But the work, whose title stands at the head of these remarks, differs essentially from all its species. As to the elegance, and even splendour, of its plates, it ranks among the highest productions of modern times; while the pre-eminent importance of the subjects which these illustrate, gives it an interest to which none of them can lay claim. The plates are THIRTY-TWO in number, descriptive of the

most interesting scenes and events recorded or alluded to in the Holy Scriptures; and are among the finest specimens of the productions of the pencil in modern times. The name of Hartwell Horne will be a sufficient guarantee for the accuracy of the geographical, topological, and historical descriptions which accompany them. He recommends it as a suitable substitute for the nonsensical, or worse, drawing-room scrap-books, which many Christians of the upper classes may have exhibited in the days of their folly and ignorance; to every visitor of true taste it must afford pleasure, and may attract many to the lively oracles, while in quest of farther information on the subjects so fascinatingly sketched, and so graphically illustrated, may receive the knowledge that makes wise unto salvation.

The true Nature of the Church of Rome, and the duty of Protestants toward her. A Sermon, preached in Lucan Church, Sept. 21, 1834. By the Rev. Fielding Ould; on the occasion of the pretended Conversion of a Protestant, &c. &c. Dublin: W. Curry and Company.

There is no parish minister but must expect, there is no faithful one that will not be prepared against, such conversions as have given rise to this Sermon. The truly useful, pious and devoted clergyman who now comes before the public, has never been afraid, and never, under God's blessing, will be ashamed to show himself watchful in his great Master's cause; and however liberals and latitudinarians may sneer and say, he need not have thrown away voice or type in making such a potter about an old besotted pensioner, whose soul might have gone to purgatory, and his carcase might have been bandied about by Papists, with all their mummery and trumpery, without a minister troubling himself about the matter; yet we deem that Mr. Ould was called on to make this exposure of the mean arts—the stern bigotry—the untired persecution with which a poor

Protestant, stupified by illness, was besieged, when married to a Popish wife, and when surrounded by none but those who think that all who do not confess to a priest must inevitably go to hell—that these poor ignorant creatures that surround a dying Protestant's bed, should thus unite in giving him no rest until he consents to surrender to their *good intentions*, is most natural, and we would be almost inclined to place it to the account of their goodness, were we not assured, that it is more to gain a triumph for their cause, more to confound their Protestant neighbours with the sight of a living Protestant being turned into a dead Papist, than any concern whatsoever for the state of the departing soul. But that a priest, an educated man, should be found lending himself to all this bigotry and delusion, that he should administer to this malignant triumph of his flock, and dare to bolster up the hope of the dying man, by putting him through the exercise of a momentary confession, and the anointing with a bit of grease. We say this is monstrous, and we announce that the man who practises and the church which sanctions such delusions must, indeed, be part and parcel of that mystical Babylon and mother of abomination, which, for all her harlotry with which she has deceived the nations, the Lord will destroy with the breath of his mouth in the brightness of his coming.—Mr. Ould, in this discourse, in a very animated and feeling way warns his young Protestant hearers, of the ruinous consequences of marriages with Roman Catholics.

A Pocket Expositor of the New Testament, designed for Christians of all denominations. By Thomas Keyworth, Author of the Daily Expositor, adapted for Family Reading, &c. &c. Hamilton and Adams. London, 1834.

This appears to us a very valuable, cheap, and convenient work useful for private instruction, and particularly useful for family wor-

ship. Exposition is all that is attempted, and this is done in a plain and sound manner; and profiting by the labours of Scott and other pious and evangelical commentators, he has supplied the heads of families with a work in *parvo*, which may be resorted to when neither time nor convenience will allow the use of their more cumbersome labours. The author aims at directing attention to the evidences of revelation; he points to the incidental proofs of the truth of the inspired volume contained in its pages; he guards against the perversion of antinomianism, and exhibiting salvation as alone of grace through the atonement of our Lord and Saviour; he presses the holy tendency of this DIVINE TRUTH.

The work contains some useful maps and illustrations, and, on the whole, we recommend it to our readers.

The Four First Principles of Disturbance Operating in Ireland. A Speech, delivered by the Rev. Chas. Boyton, at a Meeting of the Conservative Society of Ireland, held in Dublin, 7th of October, 1834. Dublin: Wm. Curry. Price 5d.

This is a luminous and valuable exposé of the state of Ireland, and the cause of its disturbed state. It should be read by all, and deeply pondered by all. Mr. Boyton, as follows, states the four causes of the *unrest* of Ireland:

"There are four principles of disturbance at work, and I beg you to mark them. There are anomalies taking place daily, eminently calculated to mislead a stranger, or a cursory observer, or even the well-acquainted with the country, whose attention has not directly been drawn to the distinction. Attend to them all. There is, first, the principle of Irish against English; there is, next, the principle of Catholic against Protestant: and these, though often and mostly conjoined, are yet distinct. There is, thirdly, the principle of democracy against

aristocracy: these are general names—but the principle will be well known when I describe it by the disposition which leads the village attorney, or the distiller, or the upper order of farmer, approaching to the squireen, to shoulder out the gentleman, to attempt to pull him down as a landlord, or as a grand juror, or as a magistrate—or perhaps, in many cases, to get possession of his influence in the county or in the borough, and send one of their own little people to Parliament. This is the principle of the agitators and democrats; and if the two former principles I have already mentioned were not in existence, we should be simply as they are in England; but the two former principles are instruments in the hands of these, of which they in truth avail themselves abundantly. Observe the way the faction works. These are O'Connell's emissaries; these are the persons who form his election clubs at borough and county elections—and who are continually endeavouring to elbow out the gentry. A word or two as to the first principle, of 'Irish against English.' It is not against English person merely, but against English law. Every one knows the law that prevails in Ireland among the lower classes respecting land—that the real property is in the occupiers—that the right of the landlord is merely an usurpation. A clever writer, in the *Courier* newspaper, has quoted a passage in a recent report of the commissioners on crown lands, where it is stated that, upon this point, the old Brehon code, in the minds of the peasantry, still subsists, and never has for seven hundred years been displaced by the English statutes. This old law, of which code of legislation the Whitefoot is the executive, the fearful executive, which, 'sworn, equipped, and armed for all the purposes of savage punishment,' is

said by Lord Wellesley to be established in every district, is the one now which is operating in the country. They are sworn to extirpate the Protestant population, in their own figurative language, 'from the cradle to the crutch.' But mark, though this system works for the agitation, it is essentially to be distinguished from it—though it has taken up the anti-Protestant principle, it is distinguished from that too—for neither agitator nor Catholic is exempt from obedience to their law; and thus you hear of the assassination of the Catholic gentleman, or the persecution of the Catholic farmer. Again, there are many of them opposed to the payment of Catholic dues—nay, they threaten to become dangerous to the influence of the Catholic clergy; hence their denunciation by Dr. Doyle. Though they do the work of the agitators, it is convenient to disavow them; hence they are denounced by Mr. O'Connell. The agitator, too, is far from being entirely identified with the Catholic clergy in the country. They already threaten the influence of the clergy, and I believe will ultimately destroy it. Hence, the disputes of Doyle and O'Connell—the Doctor having his candidate for Carlow and the Agitator his—and hence an old order of the Council of Trent is resuscitated by the Catholic bishops, to close the chapels of Ireland against the meetings of the Agitator and the collection of the rent. The fourth principle is poverty against wealth. However these four may be distinct among themselves—however they may divide, divaricate, and cross, they all converge against the Protestant. He is hit, first, as a Pro-

testant, next as an Englishman, thirdly, as identified with the aristocracy, and lastly, as connected with the proprietor."

How amply does this statement corroborate what we have said in our review of Mr. Croly's pamphlet. Mr. Boyton draws, as follows, the fearful picture of the moral state of Ireland. What a credit it is to Romanism—how proud the priests ought to be of their handywork:

"It is difficult to preserve order or common decency, even with the restrictive arm of the law, for the people, to a man, are urged to the belief, and really do believe, that every individual who holds property in the country is their enemy. The courts of justice are stained, to a frightful amount, with the crime of perjury. In what case can you not get an *alibi* sworn, even where the guilt of the person accused is beyond all controversy. And there is an almost total disregard to human life amongst the people of this country, many of whom do not deem it a matter of guilt to commit the most atrocious murders. As Mr. O'Sullivan observed, there is a spirit of hatred rankling in the minds of the people against those whom they look upon and believe to be usurpers, and they are only restrained from lifting the hand of vengeance by the want of a fitting opportunity for doing so. Therefore, I do say, that it is madness to talk against taking off coercive laws, with a view to throw power into the hands of those who would neither be likely, or desire to secure life or property, and who disregard every obligation that enjoins the preservation of peace and tranquillity."

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

IRELAND.

THE church of Rome has always shown a decided contempt for the understandings of the people; her superstitions, she knows have a deteriorating tendency, and therefore she thinks she can treat men as overgrown children—still addicted to shows and gewgaws, “pleased with a rattle,—tickled with a straw.” Surely it was with a sense of what monstrous mummery she could play off upon the Irish people in the 19th century, that the clergy ventured to consecrate, in the following manner, Marlborough-st. metropolitan popish church. We put this piece of solemn absurdity on record in the CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, in order that Protestants may see how unchangeable is the mistress of abominations: it is extracted from the Catholic Penny Magazine, a work conducted by the Dublin priests:—

SOLEMN CONSECRATION, (BY UNCTION OF ITS ALTARS, WALLS, &c.) OF THE METROPOLITAN CHURCH, MARLBOROUGH-STREET, DUBLIN.—This splendid and most august ceremony took place on Friday the 14th November, 1834, in the manner prescribed in the Roman Pontifical, which had not been performed in Dublin for 300 years before.

The celebrating prelate was the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, archbishop of Dublin, assisted by the suffragan bishops of the province: Right Rev. Dr. Kinsella of Ossory; Right Rev. Dr. Nolan, (successor to Dr. Doyle) of Kildare and Leighlin; Right Rev. Dr. Keating of Ferns; Right Rev. Dr. O'Connor, bishop of Madras; and Right Rev. Dr. Polding, bishop of New Holland. The Very Rev. Dr. Coleman, V. G.; Very Rev. J. Meyler, archdeacon; Very Rev. J. Hamilton, the clergy of the church, and all the leading clergy of the diocese took a part in the procession.

Her Excellency the Marchioness Wellesley, with her sister, Miss

Caton, and their venerable mother, (just returned from America,) headed the laity, who attended in immense numbers. The choir and music were excellent, and the whole had a most sacred and imposing effect.

The ceremony commenced at nine, and terminated about three o'clock.

FORM OF CONSECRATION.—As the consecration of a church is performed with more propriety on a Sunday, or solemn festival of a saint, the ceremony on the present occasion took place on Friday, 14th of November, being the Feast of St. Laurence, archbishop and patron of Dublin.

Agreeably to the Pontifical, the archdeacon previously announced to the clergy and laity, the name of the church about to be consecrated, and the time of the ceremony, that the consecrating prelate and those who petitioned for the consecration might fast on the preceding day.

On the evening of the 13th instant, the Most Rev. Dr. Murray prepared the reliques to be enclosed in the altar to be consecrated, depositing them with three grains of incense in a suitable vase, in which he also placed a scroll of parchment, inscribed as follows:—

“In the year of our Lord, M,DCCC,XXXIV, on the fourteenth day of November, I, Daniel, Archbishop of Dublin, have consecrated this Church and altar, in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and enclosed herein the reliques of holy martyrs; granting to all the faithful of Christ on this day, one year of true indulgence in the usual form, and forty days of indulgence to those who shall visit it upon the anniversary of this consecration.”

This vase was sealed and placed on an ornamental bearer in an appropriate place before the door of the church, with suitable lights, where vigil was kept, and the mattins and lauds chanted.

All things necessary for the consecration were prepared in the church, as holy chrism, oil, incense, burning coal, ashes, salt, wine, wax candles, lime and sand in suitable vessels, five small crosses for each altar, two lighted torches to precede the bishop, basins of water to wash his hands, two vessels of holy water, clean new altar cloths, and various other vessels necessary for the divine service. About ten feet above the ground of the interior walls, were painted twelve crosses, four on each wall, and at the top of each cross, a nail was placed to which a candle of an ounce weight was affixed. A ladder, high enough to touch those crosses, was placed for the bishop to ascend. The holy water fonts were cleaned and empty, and the passage made free round the exterior of the church.

Early in the morning of the consecration his Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Murray came to the church, and gave directions for the necessary arrangements. The twelve candles were then lighted, the episcopal seat adorned and placed upon a carpet in the centre of the church. He retired for a short time, and immediately the gates of the church were closed. The archbishop, then, attended by his clergy and people, approached where the reliques had been deposited, and commenced the ceremony, repeating in a low voice the Seven Penitential Psalms, with the Antiphon: "Remember not, O Lord, our offences." The prelate now vested himself in an amice, alb, cincture, stole, and white cope, wearing a plain mitre, and taking the pastoral staff in his left hand. A second deacon and subdeacon attended vested, with acolythes, and other ministers in surplices. When the Seven Penitential Psalms were ended, the bishop returned to the front door of the church, where a second episcopal chair was placed. Here, putting away his mitre and crozier, standing, he commenced an anthem, which the choir continued. After this he offered a prayer, and resuming his mitre, leaned prostrate in his chair whilst the chanters commenced

the litanies. After this the bishop blessed water and salt, repeating the prescribed prayers. After beginning the antiphon, he resumed his mitre, and stationing himself before the door of the church, preceded by two acolythes with burning torches, he began at the right hand, the exterior circuit of the church, accompanied by the clergy and people, and sprinkling the wall high above and the cemetery beneath, repeating the prayers, blessings, and responses. Then he struck the door above the threshold with the end of his crozier. A second circuit was then made. The choir chanted in the mean time: "Bless, O Lord, this house, &c."

When the circuit was completed, the bishop, standing before the door of the church, offered up several other prayers. Striking the doors a second time, in a loud voice he said, "Raise up your gates, &c." To which the deacon inside responded, "Who is this King of glory?"

The bishop then made a third circuit, accompanied by his clergy and people, sprinkling the cemetery and exterior of the walls, repeating the blessing, prayers, antiphons, &c. He advanced a third time to the door of the church, striking it above the threshold with the crozier, saying, "Raise up your gates, &c." To which the deacon responded as before. After the sign of the cross, the door was opened, and the bishop, accompanied by his clerical attendants, choir, and masons to cover and cement the stone, entered.

Prayers and anthems were then chanted. After thus advancing to the middle of the church, where the episcopal chair was prepared, he knelt with his face turned towards the high altar, and commenced the hymn of the Holy Ghost, "Veni Creator," which the choir continued. Meanwhile, one of the attendants sprinkled ashes over the pavement of the church, in shape of a cross, forming two lines of about twelve inches each in breadth, one commencing at the angle of the church to the left of the principal door, and carried transversely across to the angle at the right of the high altar; the other line drawn

from the two remaining opposite angles.

At the end of the hymn, the bishop resumed his mitre, and leaned prostrate upon his episcopal chair, whilst the choir continued the litanies before commenced. The blessed Virgin Mary, in whose name and honour the church was dedicated, was twice invoked, and also those saints whose reliques were deposited within. When the petition, that—“Thou wilt give eternal rest, &c.” was chanted, the bishop rose, and holding the crozier in his left hand, begged of God to “visit this place, &c.”

Then raising high his hand he formed the sign of the cross three times successively, over the church and altar, saying at each blessing, “That thou vouchsafe to bless this church and altar about to be consecrated to thy honour, and in memorial of the consecration of the Blessed Virgin Mary.”

Resp. “We beseech thee to hear us.”

After this, resigning his crozier, he leaned prostrate upon his episcopal chair, while the choir concluded the litanies, after which he rose, took off his mitre, and standing with his face to the great altar, proceeded with other prayers. After this the choir chanted the antiphon: “O how fearful is this place, &c.” and the Canticle of Zachary, from the 1st chap. 68 to 79 v. of St. Luke's Gospel. After each verse of the canticle, the anthem, “O how fearful, &c.” was repeated.

During the chant the bishop resumed his mitre and crozier, and beginning at the angle of the church, to the left of the grand entrance, according to the direction of the lines formed, described upon the ashes, with the extremity of his crozier, the letters of the Greek alphabet, at such a distance from each other, as to occupy the entire space, and in like manner on the other line he made the Latin alphabet.

After this he put on his mitre, proceeded towards the high altar, knelt down, and prayed three times, the choir answering each. Then he blessed other water, salt, ashes, and wine, in the manner prescribed.

He then advanced to the door of the church, and with the end of his crozier made the sign of the cross on the upper and lower parts of the inside, after which he prayed: “May thy invincible cross be set on this threshold, &c.” Then going back where he blessed the water, standing turned towards the great altar, he said:

“We beseech, dearest brethren, Almighty God the Father, in whose house there are many mansions, that he would vouchsafe to bless and preserve this abode, by the aspersion of this water, mixed with wine, salt, and ashes; through our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.”

After this the bishop proceeded to the altar, and there intoned the anthem, “I will go up to the house of God, to God who rejoiceth in my youth,” and repeated the 42d Psalm: “Judge me, O God, &c.” After each verse of this psalm the anthem was repeated. As soon as the anthem commenced, the bishop, retaining his mitre, standing before the altar, dipped the thumb of his right hand into the water, just then blessed, and with it and the water made a cross in the middle of the table of the altar, saying:

“May this altar be sanctified to the honour of the Almighty God, and of the glorious Virgin Mary, and of all the saints, and in the name and in memorial of the Conception of the B. V. M. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Peace be to thee.”

Then he made with his thumb, as before, dipped in the water, four crosses, in the four corners of the altar, repeating at each cross, the same words:—“May this altar, &c.”

The prayer “In virtue of that signal propitiation, &c.” ended, the bishop went round the table of the altar seven times, sprinkling it and the basement with holy water, and said each time three verses of the 50th Psalm: “Have mercy on me, O God, &c.” together with the Antiphon: “Thou shalt sprinkle me with hyssop, &c.” Subsequently he went round the interior of the church three times, sprinkling its walls with holy

water, beginning first behind the great altar, from the right side, sprinkling the walls in the lower part near the ground, and saying the anthem: "This is the house of the Lord, firmly built, well-founded on the solid rock," the choir singing the 121st Psalm: "I rejoice at the things that were said to me, &c." Going round the second time and sprinkling the walls to his own height, he said: "Let God arise, &c." Then he said the 67th Psalm, v. 27: "In the churches bless God the Lord, &c." Going round the third time, sprinkling the walls higher than before, and commencing at the left hand side, the Anthem, "He that dwelleth, &c." and the 90th Psalm (continued) "He shall say to the Lord, &c." were chanted. Then he sprinkled the floor of the church in the centre, beginning from the altar to the principal entrance, and then across from one wall to the other, the choir chanting: "My house shall be called the house of prayer, &c." Whilst he was in the middle of the church, the choir intoned, he beginning: "Jacob saw a ladder, &c." During the repetition of this he sprinkled the floor of the church, towards the east, west, north, and south. Then turning towards the principal entrance he repeated the prayers: "O God, who sanctifiest, &c."—"O God, the Almighty Sovereign, &c." and the Preface: "It is truly meet, &c." as in the Pontifical. Then receiving his mitre he went up to the altar, and with the holy water made mortar, praying: "O Almighty God, &c." The bishop and clergy then proceeded in procession to the place where the reliques were laid—the holy chrism was brought to the gates of the church, where standing outside, the bishop said: "Let us bend the knee," and repeated other prayers; then receiving his mitre he entered with the clergy, the choir chanting: "O how glorious is that kingdom, &c." then the 94th Psalm: "Come, let us praise the Lord with joy, &c." Then standing before the reliques, he prayed for some time, after which two acolythes, with lights, then the cross, the clergy chanting, he commencing. "You

shall go forth with delight, &c." After these the priests carrying the relique-bier with the reliques, and finally the bishop with his assistants. When the procession began to move, the bishop commenced the anthem: "You shall go forth, &c." which was resumed by the choir. After this the bishop and priests made a circuit round the exterior of the church, the people following exclaiming: "Lord have mercy on us." This being done, the bishop, having received his mitre, and being seated in his chair before the door of the church, addressed a few words to the people, in which he set forth the respect and reverence due to the house of God, where sacrifice is daily offered up, and the very walls by sacred unction, devoted solely to the purpose of religion. He then reminded them of the sacredness of the place, whence all noise and commerce, and secular concerns of every kind, should be removed; that, as it is called, so it may in reality be, the "House of prayer." Afterwards he pointed out the duty of the people to contribute to the support of their pastors. The archdeacon then read two decrees from the 22d and 25th Sessions of the Council of Trent, respecting ecclesiastical revenues, and their just appropriation.—After which the bishop ordered prayers to be offered up for all those who contributed towards the erection of the church, and for those who desired its consecration, granting them a share in all the spiritual advantages that shall be reaped within its holy precincts. Then he chanted the following Resp.: "The Lord shall be my God, and this stone, &c." Then turning towards the door of the church he said: "Let us pray, &c." Before he entered he dipped the thumb of his right hand into holy chrism, and marked therewith in the form of a cross the outer door of the church, saying: "In the name of the Father, &c." Then entering the church all proceeded in procession, the bishop commencing: "Enter, ye saints of God, &c." Upon arriving at the altar, in which the reliques were to be deposited, the bishop commenced the Ant. "The saints shall exult.

&c." and the Psalm 149: "Sing ye, to the Lord, &c." Psalm 150: "Praise ye the Lord, &c." and the other prayers. The bishop then resumed his mitre, and dipping his right hand in holy chrism, he anointed therewith the four corners of the sepulchre where the reliques were afterwards laid, making on each the sign of the cross. Then resigning his mitre he reverentially deposited the vessel containing the reliques, sealed as stated the preceding day, in the sepulchre of the altar, and then began the anthem. "Under God's altar, &c." Then he enclosed the deposited reliques, received his mitre, took the table or stone that closed the sepulchre, dipped his right hand thumb in holy chrism, and formed therewith the sign of the cross on the centre of the under part of the stone, saying: "Be this table (or stone) consecrated, &c." After cementing the stone which was secured by a mason, he repeated: "I heard from under the altar of God, &c." "O God, who for the dwelling, &c." Whilst the responses were made he proceeded praying, and using the words—"Be this altar sealed and sanctified in the name of the Father, &c." Then putting incense in the thurible, he said:—"Be thou blessed by Him in whose honour thou shalt burn. In the name of the Father, &c." Making the sign of the cross over the thurible, he began, the choir continuing the chant: "An angel stood by the altar, &c." Then incensing the altar in every direction, on both sides, right and left, in front and on top; when the chant was finished, he said: "May my prayer, &c." After incensing and going round the altar thrice, the choir chanted the Psalm 83: "How lovely are thy tabernacles, &c." While these were sung, the bishop, mitred and standing, dipped his right thumb in the oil of Catechumen's and with it formed five crosses, namely, in the centre and four corners of the altar, the second at the remote right or gospel corner, the third at the left from the corner, the fourth at the right front corner, and the fifth at the hinder left corner, repeating at each: "Be this stone made a second time five crosses, and

sanctified, &c." After other prayers he went round the altar, and said: "Let the ineffable tenderness, &c." "Jacob rising in the morning, &c." Psalm 91: "It is good to give praise to the Lord, &c." After this he walked round incensing the altar as before, praying "Be thou propitious, O God, &c." He then intoned, "God, thy God, &c." and Psalm 44: "My heart hath uttered, &c." He then made again five crosses, praying, and incensing the altar, as before, and continued: "Let thy holy Spirit, &c."—"The Lord hath sanctified, &c." and Psalm 45: "Our God is our refuge, &c." While this was chanted he poured out the oil of Catechumen's and chrism on the altar, rubbing the oil over with his right hand, saying: "Behold the odour of my Son,"—and Psalm 86: "The foundations thereof are in thy holy mountains, &c." Then saying, "Dearest brethren, let us pray that our Lord may bless and consecrate this stone, &c." The choir chanted, he commencing with: "Thy works are all precious, &c."—the 147th Psalm, "Praise the Lord, &c." with responses, while the bishop beginning behind the altar, anointed with holy chrism each of the twelve crosses painted on the walls of the church, saying at each unction: "May this temple be sanctified, &c." each cross being incensed thrice. The bishop returning to the altar, the choir continued, he beginning: "Moses created an altar, &c."—"We supplicantly implore the mercy of God, &c." Then blessing the incense, he said after the Antiphons: "O Lord God Almighty, &c." then sprinkling it with holy water, he formed with his hand, of this incense, four crosses, each of five grains, over those five places of the altar where the crosses of water, oil, and chrism had been made, &c. Then resigning his mitre, kneeling before the altar, he began, the choir chanting: "Come Holy Ghost, &c."—"O holy Lord, &c." The candles and incense being now consumed, the ashes were scraped away, &c. the bishop before the steps of the altar said several other anthems, prayers, &c.

He then said: "Almighty God,

in thy honour, and in that of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and in the name and memorial of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, we, though unworthy, consecrate this altar. Mercifully hear, &c." Then with his hands extended before his breast, he said the Preface: "May the Lord be with you, &c."—"It is truly meet, &c." After this he began, and the choir continued: "Confirm, O Lord, what thou hast wrought in us, &c." After the Anthem and Psalm, having applied his right thumb in chrism, making a cross in front of the altar, after an Anthem and Psalm, he said: "We humbly beseech thy majesty, O Lord! &c." Then having dipped again his right hand in chrism he anointed, in the form of a cross, the joints of the table of the altar, as if uniting them, saying at each cross: "In the name of the Father, &c." Then resigning his mitre he said: "We suppliantly beseech the Almighty and Eternal God, &c."

This last prayer being ended, subdeacons carefully wiped the table of the altar with towels of coarse linen cloth. The bishop retired to his chair, and rubbed with the pith of bread, then washed and wiped his hands, after which he retired to the vestry to prepare for Mass.

At the end of the Mass the bishop gave his solemn benediction—the indulgences were published—and all retired in peace.

BISHOP M'HALE'S INSTALLATION.

The columns of some of the Dublin newspapers have been, for the last two or three days, filled with descriptions of *fetes* which were given in the province of Connaught, in honour of the translation of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Maronia, Dr. M'Hale, from Killala to the archdiocese of Tuam. Your readers, I believe, need not be informed, that Dr. M'Hale enjoys considerable reputation in this country as an agitating priest of very *ultra* principles and more than ordinary talent. Of the Catholic bishops, he is the only one who has declared himself a repealer;

and since the death of Dr. Doyle he may be said to enjoy a monopoly of clerical popularity. His name stood first upon the list of those sent over to the see of Rome for promotion to the diocese of Tuam, and Dr. M'Hale was appointed; and a gentleman, who was in Tuam within the last few days, assures us that his journey from Killala to that town was more like the triumphant march of a conqueror than the lowly journey of a meek and humble disciple of the Founder of Christianity. Dinners, of course, were given, both in Castlebar and Tuam, in honour of Dr. M'Hale's promotion. It would be worse than a waste of time to occupy it with any account of these proceedings—the *animus* of which may be gathered from a few, a very few, but characteristic features. The first toast after dinner was, "The people, the source of all power." As a matter of form, the health of the Sovereign was given; but, lest the meeting might be subjected to an accusation of loyalty, the toast was qualified by designating the King as "the first servant of the people." I should have mentioned that, before the health of the King, the chairman proposed that of "Pope Gregory XVI." In introducing this toast, the chairman took occasion to eulogise his holiness for the firmness he displayed in resisting the intrigues which were set on foot to frustrate the appointment of Dr. M'Hale. No doubt the health of Pope Gregory XVI. will become a standing toast at our political dinners; with what advantage to the peace of the country and the stability of our institutions, we leave to the judgment of our readers. The repeal of the Union was also toasted with uproarious applause. A young orator, who rejoiced in the congenial name of ——— in speaking to this toast, distorted his imagination in drawing certain seditious parallels between the situation of Ireland and America. He had advanced so far as to say, "that America, when oppressed by England, rose up in her might, and recovered her freedom. Ireland was now oppressed, and why?"—when the prudence of the chairman restrained the

enthusiasm of this provincial Demos-thenes.

There was one very awkward occurrence took place at this dinner, which has been very carefully suppressed by the "*liberal*" papers, by which alone the thing was at all reported. In the course of the evening one gentleman took umbrage either at a particular toast, or the manner in which it was proposed. He was imprudent enough to give expression to his feelings, and as there were some persons in the room who coincided with him, a general row took place. I am informed, upon unquestionable authority, that the appearance of the room during this most disgraceful scene was really frightful. One old man, named — had his head literally laid open with a bottle! and he was sitting, too, within a few yards of his *Grace*, Dr. M'Hale, who was obliged to leave the room. This occurrence took place early in the evening—too early to suppose that the parties were under the influence of inebriety, unless we suppose them to have improved upon the Edinburgh precedent, and commenced their potations before the arrival of the guests. In the speeches of Dr. M'Hale, which are fully, and, I believe, accurately reported in the *Morning Register*, there is nothing calling for remark, except his very warm denunciation of any project for the payment of the Catholic clergy by the state.

Dr. M'Hale, the Catholic archbishop of Tuam, made a triumphal entry into Tuam one day last week. The scene, as described by a correspondent of the Dublin *Freeman's Journal*, must have been very striking. "At Castle Grove, an immense concourse of persons thronged to meet his *Grace*, and conduct him to the seat of the metropolitan see in splendour and magnificence. A large train of carriages, gigs, jaunting-cars, and a vast number of horsemen, fell in with the procession; and the students of the College of St. Jerlath, to the number of 120, in academics, approached to receive his *Grace's* episcopal benediction. At Kilbannon, which is distant about three miles from Tuam, I had an op-

portunity of estimating the numbers present; and I fear I am under the mark in setting them down at 40,000.

At Ballygaddy, the river of which divides the parishes of Kilbannon and Tuam, the clergymen who acted as administrators under his *Grace*, approached, and presented him with a large gilt cross, in token of their obedience. The archbishop received it, and, standing in his carriage, imparted to the multitude his episcopal benediction. The people were all uncovered and on bended knees."—*Extract of a letter from Connaught.*

A PRIEST CURSING HIS CONGREGATION.—The *Fermanagh Reporter*, received this morning, contains a most extraordinary document, which, it appears, had been first tendered to the *Freeman's Journal* for insertion, but was rejected by that paper. The circumstances are briefly these:—The clerk of ——— chapel, an old man of the name of — was dismissed by the curate without any cause being assigned, at which the parishioners became so indignant, that they recommended the man to ring the bell as usual for mass, on the following Sunday. This so enraged the curate, the Rev. —, that he pulled the rope by force from his hand; the parishioners interfered, whereupon the reverend gentleman, finding himself foiled, rushed up to the altar, and said in the most emphatic manner—"You all have the curse of God! and from my heart that you may!" The truth of this disgusting transaction is vouched for by seven members of the chapel committee, who have drawn up a detailed account of the whole affair.

SACERDOTAL GALLANTRY!—A reverend confessor—one of those whom Mr. Croly has so graphically depicted in his pamphlet—who presides over the spiritual concerns of the Romish population of a parish not a hundred miles from Kildorrery, on Sunday last indulged his congregation with a very edifying denunciation of two most respectable Protestant ladies. The alleged offence of these ladies was—what, reader?

That they had distributed moral and religious tracts to the peasantry on their estates! And for this they were denounced as "emissaries of hell," and their benevolent efforts to enlighten the minds, improve the morals, and promote the happiness of the people around them, converted into an occasion of insolent condemnation and abuse. "It was well for them (continued this sacerdotal despot) that I did not meet with them when distributing their tracts, for I fear that I should have amused myself with horse-whipping them!"—*Cork Constitution.*

ENGLAND.

MORE POPERY.—The new Roman Catholic chapel at Bishopwearmouth, a superb building, is rearing its stately front in all the splendour of Catholicism, when it was the state religion of the country. It is of the Gothic order of architecture, and, when finished, will stand unrivalled as the finest public building in the town. It has already assumed an imposing appearance, and its large and magnificent eastern window attracts the attention and unqualified admiration of all who have seen it. The building is of considerable magnitude, and will possess sufficient room for the display of all the ceremonials and pomp of the Romish church.

BLESSINGS OF THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM.—At Worship-street police-office, on Saturday, October 11, Mr. James Temple, of 41, Tabernacle-walk, was charged with interrupting the service at the Tabernacle Chapel, City-road, on Friday evening. A dispute has arisen among the trustees of the chapel as to the right of appointing the preachers, and the congregation is divided between the Rev. J. Campbell and the Rev. William Ragsdell, the former of whom has been appointed by Mr. Bateman, one of the trustees, and

the latter by the other trustees. On Friday, bills announced that a missionary meeting would be held in the evening, Mr. Campbell in the chair, upon which counter bills were issued, forbidding the meeting, as unauthorised, and announcing the usual service to be performed by Mr. Ragsdell. Mr. Wilks, M. P. one of the trustees, thought it advisable to obtain the assistance of the police; and no sooner had Mr. Ragsdell been locked in his pulpit, than a tremendous uproar was raised by hooting, hissing, and stamping of feet. Several persons were apprehended, but proceedings were pressed against the defendant only. He was held to bail in the sum of £50. Of late there have been frequent disturbances at both the Tabernacles, City-road and Tottenham-court-road, which were originally built by subscription for the celebrated Mr. Whitfield, and have at length devolved to twelve trustees, the chief of whom appears to be Mr. John Wilks, M. P. for Boston, whose father, the Reverend Matthew Wilks, was long the popular minister of the Tabernacle.

EDUCATION OF THE POOR.—During the past and the present year 328 schools have been received into union with the National Society, carrying up the amount of schools in union to the number of 2937; and £6,643 have been voted in aid of the building school-rooms in 104 places, the total expense of the buildings being estimated at £20,000. The Society has recently made a general inquiry into the state of education under the Established Church in all parts of the kingdom; and an account has been obtained concerning 8650 places, which were found to contain about 11,000 schools, with 678,356 children. It is calculated that there cannot be less in England and Wales than 710,000 children under the instruction of the clergy.—*Morning Herald.*

INDEX TO VOLUME III.

- Address at the Clerical Breakfast Meeting, by the Rev. Henry Woodward, 338.
- Affairs, Public, View of, for 1833, 1.
- Assassins, History of the, 243.
- Autobiography of a Dissenting Minister, Vol. I. Review of, 924.
- Belfast Unitarian Discussion, Review of, 668.
- Biblical Keepsake, Notice of, 937.
- Blessed are the Meek. A Sermon, by H. W., 217.
- Boyd's the Fathers not Papists, Review of, 846.
- Butler's Analogy, Remarks on, 558.
- Catechistical Societies, 429.
- Catholicity, Conversions to, 65.
- Character of the Romish Priesthood, 428.
- Cherubim, on the, 527.
- Children of Religious Parents, 103. 155.
- China, Notices Concerning, 501.
- Cholera, a Poem on, 170.
- Christ, on the Priesthood of, 17.—
On being ashamed of, 730.
- Christian, on the Happiness and Trials of, 729.
- Christianity, Historical Proof of, 674.
- Church, Million Act, 61; Reform, Proposal for, 108; Fund, 209; Cess, *ib.*; in Russia, 216; of Rome, 209; Temporalities Bill, 284; Where is the? 368; the Established, on the Propriety of Continuing in Union with the, 371; of Ireland, on its Present State, 493; of England and Rome Compared, 730; Metropolitan, Solemn Consecration of, 941.
- Church and the Home Mission, Review of, 547.
- Collins' Nature and Attributes of the Church, Review of, 347.
- Committees of Religious Societies, on, 734; of the Duties and Responsibilities of Members, 513.
- Conformity to the World, on, 240, 410.
- Connaught, Superstitions in, 499.
- Constantinople, Greek and Turkish Accounts of the Capture of, Review of, 470, 535.
- Conspiracy to Procure the Execution of a Protestant, 358.
- Convocation, on, 162.
- Cork, New Church in, 62; Grand Juries and Charities, 64.
- Cowper, Taylor's Life of, Review of, 73.
- Critical Notices.—The Crusaders, by Keightley, 54; M'Ghee's Letter to O'Connell, 201; Hymns for Childhood, 209; Mrs. Guinness' Sacred Portraiture, and other Poems, 281; Mendham's Memoir of the Council of Trent, *ib.*; Edinburgh Cabinet Library—Persia, *ib.*; Sacred Classics, 282; the Rainbow, *ib.*; King's Metrical Exercises upon Scripture Texts, 788; Thornburgh's Sermon, Preached in Ringsend Chapel, 789; M'Culloch's Manual of English Grammar, *ib.*; Westoby's Helps to Repentance, *ib.*; Sprague's Hints, Designed to Regulate Christian Intercourse, 790; Bailey's Liturgy Compared with the Bible, *ib.*; Bagster on the Management of Bees, 935; Meditations, or Remains of L. S. 936; Lives of Eminent Zoologists, in Edinburgh Cabinet Library, 937; the Biblical Keepsake, *ib.*; the True Nature of the Church of Rome, 938; Keyworth's Pocket Expositor, *ib.*; Boyton's Speech on the Four Principles of Disturbance Operating in Ireland, 939.
- Croly, on the Romish Church in Ireland, Review of, 793, 865.
- Crucifixion, Lines on the, 353.
- Detached Thoughts, 783.

- Dick's Lectures on Theology, Review of, 373.
 Divine Omnipotence, on the Nature of, 23.
 Doyle, Doctor, Notice of his Death, 501.
 Dublin City Mission, 499.
 Duties and Responsibilities of Members of Committees, 513.
 Ecclesiastical Corporations, 211.
 Eloquence of the Irish Pulpit, on the, 433.
 Essay on White Lies, 316.
 Eternal Duration, Thoughts on, 854.
 Evil, on the Origin of, 731.
 Exercitation on Matthew, viii. 18-34, 452.
 Faith, Thoughts on, 779.
 Fanaticism, Review of, 261.
 Fathers the, not Papists, Review of, 846.
 France, Evangelical Press of, 430; Protestant Schools in, 574.
 Fraser's History of Persia, Notice of, 281.
 Germany, Theological Education in, 223, 303, 515.
 Gifts, on the Use of, 48.
 God, on the Mercy of, 735, 863; On the Character of, 783.
 Guinness', Mrs. Poems, Notice of, 281.
 Haldane's Evidence and Authority of Divine Revelation, Review of, 465.
 Hardman's Exposition of 1st Corinthians, Review of, 888.
 Heman's, Mrs. Hymns for Childhood, Notice of, 209.
 Hill, Rev. Rowland, Life of, by Sydney, Review of, 486.
 Historical Proof of Christianity, 674.
 Holy Ghost, the, Bed of, 498.
 Home Mission, the, 643.
 Hooker's Works, Hanbury's Edition, Review of, 589.
 India, horrible Suttie, 431.
 Installation of Bishop M'Hale, 946.
 Ireland, on the Palatine Settlements in, 50; on Scriptural Education in, 183; on the Present State of its Church, 493; What is the Cause of its Poverty? 404.
 Irish Society, 356.
 Jews, Correspondence between Two, 185.
 John, xii. 20-28, Remarks on, by H. W., 12.
 John, xii. 20-26, Remarks on, by R. D., 89.
 Kelly, Rev. R. Reply to R. D., 269.
 Knox and Jebb's Correspondence, Review of, 623, 687.
 Lawfulness of Retaining Riches, 481.
 Lies, an Essay on, 316.
 Life and Death, on the Effect of Prospects of, 842.
 Limerick, Bishop of, Notice of his Death, 69.
 Liturgy, on the, 189, 328, 642.
 Love of the World, a Sermon, 649.
 Mason, Mr. Monck, on the Errors of the Irish Bible, 351.
 Matthew, viii. 18-34, an Exercitation on, 452.
 Mayo, Religious Processions in, 568.
 M'Ghee, Rev. I. L. Letter to Daniel O'Connell, Notice of, 201.
 M'Hale, Bishop, Account of his Installation, 946.
 M'Leod, Rev. Dr. of Campsie, Irish Tour, 65.
 Meek's Reasons for Attachment and Conformity to the Church of England, Review of, 756.
 Memory and Hope, Thoughts on, 585, 679.
 Mendham's Memoirs of the Council of Trent, Notice of, 281.
 Mercy of God, on the, 735, 863.
 Metropolitan Catholic Church, Account of the Solemn Consecration of, 941.
 Millenarians and Romanists, Parallel between the, 331; Reply to, 458, 857.
 Missionary Researches in Armenia, Review of, 908.
 Mohammedanism and its Sects, by Taylor, Review of, 597.
 More, Mrs. Hannah, Life and Correspondence, Review of, 737, 817.
 Mortuary Societies, 429.
 Nature of the Divine Omnipotence, 23.
 Naval and Military Bible Society, 500.
 New Zealand, the Lord's Day in, 284.
 Obituary.—Right Rev. John Jebb, Bishop of Limerick, 69; Doctor Doyle, 501; Dr. Schleiermacher, of Berlin, 571; S. T. Coleridge, 645; John James M'Gregor, 792.

- O'Brien's Sermons on Justification, Review of, 289.
- On Imputed Righteousness, 560, 769; Remarks on, by I. A., 764.
- Palatine Settlements in Ireland, on the, 50.
- Parallel between the Millenarians and Romanists, 331; Remarks on, By M. 458, 857.
- Parents Religious, on the Children of, 103, 155.
- Polemical Controversy, on, 592.
- Poor, Education of, 948.
- Poor's Rates, 209.
- Popery, Renunciation of, 288; the Lying Wonders of, 569.
- Popery in Newfoundland, 213; in Switzerland, 288.
- Popish Superstition, Progress of, 280.
- Poverty, Ireland's, what is the Cause of? 404.
- Presbyterian Church in Ireland, History of, by Mr. Reid, Review of, 612, 657.
- Priest, a, Cursing his Congregation, 947.
- Priesthood, Romish, the Grasping Character of, 428.
- Priesthood of Christ, on the, 17.
- Priests' Dues, Resistance to, 62.
- Protestant, Conspiracy to procure the Execution of, 358.
- Protestant Schools in France, 574.
- Public Affairs, for 1833, view of, 1.
- Purgatorian Societies, 429.
- R. D.'s Answer to the Rev. T. Kelly's Reply to the Rev. W. Burgh, 109.
- Regium Donum, the, 428.
- Reid's History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, Review of, 612, 657.
- Religion, on the Tendency of, to Unite, and of Irreligion to Dis-unite, 732.
- Religious Intelligence, 57, 209, 284, 356, 419, 498, 568, 941.
- Religious Societies, on Committees of, 734.
- Religious Views and Dispositions, on, 786.
- Remarks on Butler's Analogy, 558.
- Review of Taylor's Life of Cowper; 73; of Search's Considerations on the Law of Libel, 145; of Fanaticism, 261; of O'Brien's Sermons on Justification, 289; of Collins' Nature and Attributes of the Church, 347; of Dick's Lectures on Theology, 373; of the Law of Anti-Religious Libel reconsidered, by the Rev. J. Blanco White, 386; of Haldane's Evidence and Authority of Divine Revelation, 465; of Greek and Turkish Accounts of the Capture of Constantinople, 470, 585; of Sydney's Life of the Rev. Rowland Hill, 486; of the Church and the Home Mission, 547; of Hooker's Works, Hanbury's edition, 589; of Taylor's History of Mohammedanism and its Sects, 597; of Reid's History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, 612, 657; of Knox and Jebb's Correspondence, 623, 687; of the Belfast Unitarian Discussion, 668; of the Voluntary System, by a Churchman, Part I. 683, Parts II. and III. 924; Roberts' Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More, 737, 817; of Meek's Reasons for Attachment and Conformity to the Church of England, 756; of Rev. Hugh White's Sermons, 773; of Croly on the Romish Church in Ireland, 793, 865; of the Fathers not Papists, 846; of Hardman's Exposition of 1 Corinthians, 888; of Missionary Researches in Armenia, 908; of the Autobiography of a Dissenting Minister, Vol. I. 924.
- Riches, on the Lawfulness of Retaining, 481.
- Righteousness, on Imputed, 560, 769; Remarks on, 764.
- Rome, on the Church of, and the Theatre, 733.
- Russia, the Church in, 216, 285.
- Sabbath Scenes, 63.
- Sacerdotal Gallantry, 947.
- Sacred Classics, Notice of, 282.
- Saint Simonian Mission in London, 66.
- Savings' Banks, 429.
- Saxony, Roman Catholic Church, 67.
- Search's Considerations on the Law of Libel, Review of, 145.
- Scripture Miracles, on the Apparent Incredibility of, 729.
- Scriptural Education in Ireland, on, 183.
- Sermon, the, of a Roman Catholic Archbishop, contrary to his Church and Creed, 46.

- Sermon, by H. W. 361.
 Sermon—"Blessed are the Meek," by H. W. 217.
 Sermon, preached in St. Peter's Church, for the Female Orphan House, by Rev. H. Woodward, 505.
 Sermon, on the Belief and General Practice of Christians, 577; on the Love of the World, 649.
 Sermons, by the Rev. Hugh White, A. M., Review of, 773.
 Smith and Dwight's Missionary Researches in Armenia, Review of, 908.
 S. N.'s Answer to the Rev. Joseph Blanco White, 414.
 Spirit, on the Dispensation of the, 787.
 Sprague's Hints, designed to Regulate the Intercourse of Christians, Notice of, 790.
 St. Doulogh's a Tour to, by C. O. 120, 279.
 St. Kuran's Lough, 498.
 Superstition, Popish, Progress of, 280,
 Superstitions, Popular, in Ireland, 498.
 Sunday Schools, 532.
 Sunday School Society, Twenty-third Report, 62.
 Switzerland, the Church in, 286.
 Teachers and Exhorters, 89.
 Taylor's Life of Cowper, Review of, 73.
 Taylor's History of Mohammedanism and its Sects, Review of, 597.
 Theological Education in Germany, 223, 303, 515.
 Thoughts on the Propriety of Continuing in Union with the Established Church, 371.
 Thoughts on Memory and Hope, 585, 679.
 Thoughts and Reflections, 729.
 Thoughts on Faith, 779; on Eternal Duration, 854.
 Tithe, on the Recovery of, 808.
 Tour to St. Doulogh's, and on to the Boyne, by C. O., 120, 279.
 Unitarian Discussion, Belfast, Review of 668.
 Use of Gifts, on the, 48.
 Vine, the True, 354.
 Vision, a, 30.
 Voluntary System, Blessings of the, 948.
 Voluntary System, the, by a Churchman, Review of, Part I. 683, Parts II. and III. 924.
 White, Rev. Hugh, Sermon by, 721; his Sermons Reviewed, 773.
 White, Rev. J. Blanco, the Law of Anti-Religious Libel reconsidered, Review of, 386.
 Woodward Rev. H. Sermons by, 217, 361, 505, 577, 649.
 Zoologists, Lives of Eminent, by Macgilvray, Notice of, 937.

END OF VOL. III.



